



**"Shree Agamodaya Samiti Series."**

---

**SPEECHES AND WRITINGS** 4085  
**OF**

**Virchand R. Gandhi,**

**B. A., M. R. A S. BARRISTER-AT-LAW,**

**THE JAIN DELEGATE TO THE PARLIAMENTS OF  
RELIGIONS, CHICAGO U. S. A (1893.)**

**Hony. Secretary to  
The Jain Association of India.**

---

# **THE JAIN PHILOSOPHY.**

**COLLECTED**

**BY**

**BHAGU F. KARBHARI.**

**EDITOR.**

**'THE JAIN' AND THE 'PATRIOT, BOMBAY.'**

---

**PUBLISHED BY**

**Venichand Surchand Shah**

**FOR**

**Shree Agamodaya Samiti.**

**BOMBAY.**

**SECOND EDITION.**

**PRICE Re. 7**

**1924**

**[COPIES 1000.]**

---

PRINTED AT THE JASWANTSINEJI PRINTING  
'PRESS, LIMBDI, KATHIAWAR.

---

MRS. KESARBEN NAGINDAS SANGHAVI.








But Viva said quickly "There is no comparison: Vivekananda is an adept of vituperation but Mr. Gandhi is sincere and true. I admire Mr. Gandhi more than any man I ever heard of."

*"Ella Sterling Cummins"*



# SHRI KESARBAI GNAN BHANDAR & GURUMANDIR



Erected at Patan, Nagimbhai Hall, by Sheth Nagindas Karamchand Sanghvi, in holy memory of Acharya Maharaj Vijaya Kamal Surishwaraji after the death of his wife Mrs Kesarbai N Sanghvi







## FOREWORD.

---

The Jain Philosophy, a volume containing the speeches and writings of the late Mr. Virchand Raghavji Gandhi, was edited and published by the Late Mr. B. F. Karbhari, the editor of the Jain paper. The Further speeches and writings Yoga Philosophy & Karma Philosophy were published by Sheth Devchand Lalbhai Jain Pustakodhar Fund, and it is therefore that we publish the second editions of these volumes the whole series of the speeches and writings of the late Mr. V. R. Gnadhi. As far as we are concerned as we have heard there are further speeches & writings then these three volumes wut the matter has remained with Mr. B. F. K.

In a short volume Mr. Gandhi lays open the outlines of the principles of Jainism in an interesting and lucid manner to the English knowing public. He was a pioneer among the Jains to preach the principles of the Jain philosophy outside India, and we regret that his great and useful work has not only progressed after his demise, but no attempt whatsoever has been made to maintain the enthusiasm created by him. Not only that but the success and influence attained by him are, not availed of.

The Jain theory is based on reason and not on superstition and it is therefore that it can be accepted



by every human being on the earth. It is based on right faith, right knowledge, right conduct, tempered with merey, the foundations of true religion. The analysis and synthesis of the principles contained in these words require skilful handling when they are to be placed before the larger public than the devoted Jains only.

It is most essential that every educated Jain should go through this present volume, wherein he will find several topics that will interest him and widen his knowledge. The whole book is written in a language free from technical words and affords easy reading even to a layman. The book will also interest western scholars and will be found of real importance to the students of the Jain principles and theory.

It is a pity to find that these important Volumes are not translated into vernaculars, as the Jain brethren in general could realize the importance of the work done by Mr. Virchand Raghavji Gandhi and we wish that this book will be translated in the near future in all vernaculars, so that all Jains may avail of the work done by Mr. Gandhi. .

So with confidence we recommend this book to the public desirous of knowing principles of Jainism and wish this book will have every success.

21 July 1924.

AHMEDABAD. }

K. P. Mody

B. A., LL. B.

# General Outlook.

## OF

### Shree Agamodaya Samiti.<sup>1</sup>

1. **Start:—**This institution was started at Bhoyani in Virāngaum Taluka of the Ahmedabad District on Maha Shudi 10th of Sanvat year 1971 ( 25th January 1915 A. D. ) Monday. This village Bhoyani is well known in Jain Annals as it contains the celebrated Jain Tirtha ( a holy place ) of Mallinatha, their 19th Tirthankara. It was started at the suggestion of Pannyasa Anandsagarjee ( at present Acharya Shri Sagaranandjee. ) by Sheth Venichand Surchand and others with the consent of Pannyasa Anandsagarjee, Pannyas Manivijayji, pannyasa Meghavijayjee and several other Jain ascetics of different Gachchhas and with the consent of a number of Jains. This day being the anniversary day on which the image of Mallinatha was installed, a number of Jains both laymen and ascetics assembled there that day.

- 2 **Objects.—**1. To enable Jain ascetics to acquire the knowledge of the heart of Jainism by studying in the prescribed ways the sacred books from ascetics well versed in them.

2. To edit and publish Jain sacred books styled Agamas in necessary copies thus to make easy the obtaining of them (copies), in different places.

### 3. Fulfilment of objects.

- a. To further the first object, the knowledge of some Agamas was imparted at Patan (Northern Gujarat). Kapadvanj in the Kaira District, Ahmedabad, Surat, Palitan and Rutlam in Malwa.

- b. To further the second object this institution has published the following sacred books (Agamas) and other Jain books:—

Sutra-Kritanga, Sutra 2nd.

Sthananga, Sutra 3rd

Samavayanga, Sutra 4th,

Bhagavati, Sutra 5th.

Gnata-Dharma-Katha, Sutra 6th.

Upasaka-Dashanga, Sutra 7th.

Antakrit-Dashanga and two other Sutras,  
8th 9th and 10th

Pranshna-Vyakarana, Sutra 11th.

Pragnapa, Sutra 15th.

Surya-Pragnapti, Sutra 18th

Niryavali and four other Sutras, 19th to 23rd.

Guchchhachara Prakirnakam.

Avashyaka Sutra in four volumes, Ogha-  
Niryukti

Nandi Sutra

Ashtaka by Haribhadra Suri.

Four collection of 36 verses (about Pudgala matter) and other subjects.

Dharma Bindu.

Alphabetical index of Visheshavashyaka Bhashya.

Translation of versess Vishe-shavashyaka Bhashya with extracts from the commentary.

Vichara-sara-prakarana.

Sadhu Samachari.

**4. Managing body:**—In general and Managing Committees of this institution there are many members and the present workers that constitute the Managing Committee are as under: —

1. Venichand Surchand Esq.
2. Manilal Surajmal „
3. Hiralal Bakordas „
4. Bhogilal Halabhai „
5. Kunverji Anandjee „
6. Chunilal Chhaganlal „
7. Kamalshubhai Gulabchand „
8. Jivanchand Sakerchand Javeri Esq.

**5. Offices**—Till some time past the office of this institution was kept at the places, where the knowledge of the Agamas was imparted and other suitable places thus changing the same from time to time. Now the

Head Office of this institution is at No. 426, Javeri Bazar Bombay No. 2. and the branch office for selling the printed books of this institution at Sheth Devchand Lalbhai's Dharamshala Gopipura, Surat.

6. Pecuniary position—This institution at present has about Rs. 45000/- (forty five-thousand) partly subscribed, partly got from the interest, partly from the sales of books published by this institution. Besides the sum about Rs. 13000/- (thirteen thousand) partly subscribed, and partly got from the interest is to the credit of Agama-Vanchana-Katha. From these the expenses in this connection are met.

AHMEDABAD,

24-9-1924.

}

K. P. Modi,

B. A., LL. B.

---

# PREFACE.

OF

*1st Edition 1910.*

---

*Ce n'est que la premier pas qui couste* as the French have it. It is the first step that is difficult—that taken the rest follows swimmingly. But very few people can have any idea as to how difficult the “first step” is in an undertaking like the present—particularly in India. In spite of the progress that has undoubtedly been made in various directions under the ages of the *Pax Britannica* it is a fact that our people—even our educated people—have not yet developed the faculty of perspective. We have not yet learnt to look beyond to day. A great man delivers an address on an important subject, it is listened to by large audiences, just noticed in the ephemeral columns of the Press and—well, forgotten the next day; at any rate neglected, no steps being taken to embody it in a permanent form. One of the most elevating and instructive portions of English literature is the record it possesses of the “noble thoughts of noble minds.” Humanity, which is only a synonym for Vanity, thinks of perpetuating itself by the help of “presentments” manufactured with the help of science.

Even "the meanest of mankind" gets himself photographed and, poor man, thinks that he will go down to prosperity! And yet even *science* fails and after some time the "presentment" disappears and the card board only remains! No. Such "presentments," *such* photographs of the *body* will never avail, never be of any utility to the people of Hindusthan. Photographs of some of the foremost men of the day are being hawked about in the streets. They are the photos only of the *bodies* of these men. Has any body ever taken care to photograph the hearts, the minds, the souls of these great men? It is with shame that I say that the sons of India have disgraced themselves by their lethargy in this department of literature. But luckily for mankind some of the noble "minds", remembering that no prophet is honoured in his country, take care to leave behind them in manuscript form the choicest of their matured thoughts and thus confer an inestimable boon on their kind. Mr. Virchand R. Gandhi was one of such minds. Luckily for his community and countrymen in general he has written out many of the important discourses delivered by him in India, England and America. It is six years now since his brief but brilliant career came prematurely to a close, and during this period no attempt has been made by any of his followers or colleagues to place the mind of the man before the public, to give a succinct idea as to what he did in England and America, in what diverse ways he rendered important services to our cause and religion by preaching the sublime principles of Jainism, not only in his mother

country but also in far off lands. An humble attempt has been made in the following pages to place the man and his mind before the public.

I must here gratefully admit that this attempt to collect the speeches and writings of Mr. Gandhi is due to the intelligent suggestion and spontaneous generosity of my friend Shet Jivanchand Dharamchand Javeri of Bombay, but for whose encouraging help such an attempt on my part would have been impossible. And it is with the greatest pleasure that I here admit that not only myself but the whole Jain community ought to be grateful to this munificent Bombay merchant.

As for the plan of the book I have divided it into two parts. The present volume contains almost everything that Mr. Gandhi had to say about Jainism. There is no publication at present extant which can help laymen to study and intelligently understand Jain religion and philosophy. I sincerely hope the present volume will serve as a hand-book for this purpose to our rising young generation. The second volume will contain the speeches and writings of Mr. Gandhi on the Yega philosophy from the Jain point of view.

I have tried my best to collect as many of the speeches and writings of Mr. Gandhi as I could get access to and have succeeded in getting together a valuable collection. But it is possible that there are many others which my industry has not been able to discover. If



there are any such in the hands of the followers or colleagues of the departed man, I will thank them to let me know of them as they will form a valuable addition to the second volume to be published. But even if any further writings may not come forth yet I can safely say that the collection here offered contains the best and ripest work of Mr. Gandhi's mind.

In conclusion, I have only to offer my sincere thanks to all those who have helped me to trace and collect these speeches and writings and to Mr. Manilal N. Doshi B.A. who has taken pains in going through the proofs.

"Jain" office, Fort }  
Bombay.

BHAGU F. KARBHARI.

---

# THE JAIN PHILOSOPHY.

V. R. GANDHI, B. A., M. R. A. S.

BAR-AT-LAW.



## VOCABULARY.

---

Adharmāstikāya, 3, 184.

Ahimsā, 244.

Ajiva, 146.

Anekāntvāda, 18, 23, 238.

Arhat, 20, 109, 110, 113, 131, 232, 349.

Āryan, 32, 83.

Āryāvarta, 91.

Asura, 134, 137.

Āshrava, 243.

Ātman, 20, 32, 134.

Avadhi, 21.

---

Bandha, 243.

Bhagavat Gītā, 92.

Bhārat, 263.

Brahmā, 50.

Brāhman, 7, 23.

---

Chandāl, 229.

Chārvāka, 131.

Charitra Dharma, 1.  
Chhāndogya, 134.

---

Deva, 4, 134, 135.  
Dharma, 32, 244.  
Dharmāstikaya, 3, 184.  
Dhārmika, 32.  
Dharm-shāshtra, 181.  
Dravya, 146  
Dravyārthik-naya, 1, 146.  
Drishti-rāga, 30.

---

Gnān-marga, 181.

---

Indra, 135, 137, 138, 139.

---

Jina, 1, 15, 231, 269

---

Karma, 6, 7, 20, 21, 27, 58, 144, 146, 172, 181,  
183, 227, 242, 243, 244, 245.

Karma-mārga, 181, 242

Karman, 4, 7, 144

Kshamā-shramana, 245

Kurān, 10

---

Mahāvira, 20, 227, 228,

Mahāvratā, 8.

Manushya, 4.  
 Manvantara, 5.  
 Māyā, 236.  
 Mīmāṃsaka, 19.  
 Moksha, 4, 20, 133, 243  
 Mukti, 21, 22, 23.  
 Munists, 20.

---

Naiti, 23  
 Naiyāyika, 19  
 Naya-Vāda, 238  
 Nara-Medha, 225  
 Naraka, 4  
 Nirjarā, 243.  
 Nigunta, 24  
 Niryukti, 245  
 Nirvāna, 21, 144, 176.  
 Nyāya, 130, 131.

---

Om, 44, 97, 108, 109.

---

Pāpa, 243  
 Paramo Dharma, 244.  
 Patāvali,  
 Paryārthik Naya, 1, 46  
 Pralaya, 5  
 Prākṛiti, 16, 132, 133, 233.  
 Prajā Pati, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140.

Prakaran, 245.

Purusha, 20 132, 133.

Punya, 243.

---

Rishis, 304.

Rupa, 144.

---

Samvara, 3, 243.

Sanskrit, 6, 56, 71.

Sāṅkhya, 16, 19, 132, 133.

Sankar, 19.

Sati, 111.

Sangnā, 144.

Samyag-gnāna, 235.

Sansāra, 243.

Sansārika, 243.

Shruta-Dharma, 1, 2.

Shudra, 40.

Sutras, 18.

Svastika, 97, 99, 100, 101,

Svayam-Prakāsha, 134.

Syād-vāda, 23, 238.

---

Tirthankara, 7, 231.

Tiryancha, 4.

---

Upanishad, 15.

---

Vaisheshika, 19, 130, 131, 132.

Veda, 143, 220, 225, 295.

Vedānt-sutras, 18.

Vedānt, 7, 14, 132, 133, 181, 239.

Vedāntist, 6, 140, 145.

Vedāntika, 140.

Vedik, 15, 19, 223, 226, 295.

Vignāna, 144.

---

Yoga, 133.

Yogis, 199.

---









The Late Mr Virchand Raghavji Gandhi  
Bar-at-law

# THE LATE MR. VIRCHAND R. GANDHI B. A., M. R. A. S.



## A BRIEF SKETCH OF HIS SHORT BUT USEFUL CAREER.



“Give me the making of a nation’s *ballads* and, I will leave its history to any body.” These are pregnant words. Fortunately INDIA requires no more ballads today. They are necessary for a country that is passing through the first, the crude process of “self-building.” INDIA requires no ballads. She has the oldest, grandest and greatest epics in the world—epics immortal. Her epics and other monumental religious works are the only key which has so far opened to the moderns the secrets almost of the infancy of the world. But by a strange law of cotrariety a country that was once rich in history and lyrical biography has become to-day a pauper in that department

by the absolute absence of authentic and instructive biographies of men of to day, men who have stood sponsors, in a thousand ways, at the cradle of Young INDIA. True, some of these have merely been "comets of a season," men cut off in the prime of life just as their genius was budding into blossom. But even then they had their day. They were active influences, living forces in the various communities they belonged to. Can a community or a country be said to be doing its duty if it allows the memory of such men to be wasted away like letters written on sand ? Any country or community that is guilty of such a crime need never expect to win the race in the terrible struggle for existence which modern conditions have made more terrible, more strenuous than it need have been. A generation that loses the "foot" prints of its great and good men does injustice not only to the memory of these individuals, but may be said literally to be cutting the ground from underneath its own feet, in as much as it does not leave to its successors the "presentment" of the men that played an important part in moulding its character and destiny. In this respect India has been unpardonably guilty since the advent of the British in INDIA and since this country went under the direct control of its present Rulers. Many men in various parts of this hoary land

have lived " their day " and illumined the whole land with the glory of their genius and achievements. And, yet, how many of them have had their Boswells ? Unfortunately, the supreme importance of national biographies has yet not been thoroughly grasped by the people of this land. It is a pity but it is true. All around us we hear cries of the new awakening, the forces that are said to be about to make their stupendous influence felt. There is also the question of education *on national lines*. Yet, most of us have lost sight of one of the most potentia channels of National education—that of national biography. Apart from what may be called All-INDIA biographies, even single communities neglect the sacred duty of rising biographic monuments to the memory of men who have exercised not a little influence over their affairs in their life time. The writing of the life stories of such men is a duty, indeed ! But more important still is the duty of preserving it in a permanent form—the grains of gold, the noble thoughts they gave utterance to, the achievements of their pen, that mighty instrument of little men. The smaller the Community the less excuse there is for its leaders to allow the memory and thoughts of such men to lapse. It is almost a moral and a communal crime. No community in INDIA has been

more guilty of this crime than the Jain community. Writing as a Jain I am simply sorry for my inability to give expression to the indignation I feel, on account of my community's deplorable neglect in the matter of writing the biographies and preserving the writings of very few men that have upheld its intellectual and religious prestige, who have tried to vivify their interness and to prove that though small, they are yet not a negligible quantity in this ancient land. One of such men was the late Mr. VIRCHAND GANDHI. I have undertaken the publication, in a handy form, of his speeches and writings as a pure Labour of love, and take this opportunity of placing before the members of my community a brief sketch of his short but useful career.

Mr. GANDHI was born of poor but gentle parents on the 25th of August 1864 in a small village named MAHUWA near BHAVNAGAR, in KATHIAWAR, RAGHVJI his father, was a jeweller by profession and had earned for himself a fair competency. He was a very orthodox Jaina and fully subscribed to all the varried tennents of Jaina religion. Though without any education, as the word is understood now a days, he had an enlightened mind which instinctively revolted against anything which he thought to be irrational,

unwholesome or incongruous in the social life of his co-religionists. Only one instance will suffice to illustrate this noble trait in his character. It was VIRCHAD'S father who put a stop to the cruel customs weeping and beating, the breast on the death of a relative which prevailed in his community. It required great moral courage to tackle such a delicate social question, but he did it manfully and successfully. The love of reform young VIRCHAND may thus be said to have inherited from his father. He went through the usual vernacular course of primary education in a small village under an old fashioned pedagogue and was then taken by his parents to BHAVNAGAR as they desired to give him an English education. Young VIRCHAND was uniformly diligent and industrious during his school career and passed the matriculation examination of the BOMBAY UNIVERSITY in 1880. With a view to complete his son's education, RAGHAVJI migrated to BOMBAY and VIRCHAND had the satisfaction of seeing his name enrolled as a student of the premier college of the Presidency, i.e. ELPHINSTONE. His work there was characterised more by seriousness than brilliancy and he graduated in the year 1884, when just twenty-one. The leading members of his community had followed his progress with great interest and had come to have great confidence in him.



He had barely taken leave of his *Alma Mater* when he was called upon to undertake the duties of Secretary to the JAIN ASSOCIATION OF INDIA. It was a great responsibility to be placed upon such young shoulders but the leading Jains had full confidence in VIRCHAND and his subsequent career proved that the confidence was not misplaced. He began his apprenticeship to public life with earnest enthusiasm and soon put a new complexion upon the affairs of the ASSOCIATION. His activity, considering his youth and inexperience, was extraordinary and the Association soon came to be looked upon as a very important useful institution by Jains all over INDIA. His first great achievement was the bringing about a reconciliation between the Jain community and Sursinghji, the late Thakor Sahab of Palitana, who had picked up a quarrel upon the imprisonment of some of the clerks of the firm of ANANDJEE KALYANJEE, an institution for looking after the interests of the Jains of India. The Thakor Sahab used to levy from every pilgrim to SHATRUNJAYA HILL the sum of Rs. 2 as a *Mudka* (a kind of tax) for the upkeep of the Hill. This tax was a great hardship on poor Jains who were deprived of the satisfaction of paying their homage to the sacred shrine. Mr. VIRCHAND felt deeply the cruel injustice of the tax and at once took up the matter in hand. He

managed to have interviews with Col. WATSON the P. A. M. K. and LORD REAY the then enlightened Governor of BOMBAY. He convinced the of them injustice at the tax and through their powerful influence obliged the Thakor Saheb to come to an amicable arrangement on the question. The chief was to be paid Rs. 15,000 annually as *Rakhopa* (up-keep) and he was to do away with the tax. The arrangement was hailed with grateful satisfaction by thousands of poor Jains who had hitherto been denied the pleasure of a pilgrimage to the great shrine.

It was time now for the young man to think of some permanent settlement in life and he thought of Law. With the object of qualifying himself for the profession of a solicitor he signed articles in 1885 with Messrs Little & Co. the Government Solicitors. His work as secretary of the Jain Association was so well appreciated that many of his leading co-religionists in BOMBAY and AHMEDABAD voluntarily offered him pecuniary aid for the successful prosecution of his legal studies. Although thus seriously engaged in equipping himself for what he intended to be his profession, his active interest in the affairs of the Jain community never slackened and he was as ready as ever to lead every forelorn Jain cause For example, in 1891 an European named Mr. BEDAM opened

a Slaughter House on the hill of SOMET SHEKHAR, in BENGAL, for the preparation of tallow. How deeply the religious feelings of the Jains must have been agrieved at this can well be imagined. A suit against the European gentleman was at once filed in one of the subordinate Courts of CALCUTTA but it was not successful. Upon this Mr. VIRCHAND himself went to CALCUTTA and lodged an appeal in the High Court. It was an intricate case several important legal and religious issues being involved. But nothing could daunt the young man's ardour. He remained in the City of Palaces for several months, learnt the Bengali language and himself translated in to English all the Vernacular documents appertaining to the case. With wonderful industry and patience he collected a large amount of evidence and with the help of a number of rock inscriptions coins etc. and other evidence convinced the Judges of the justice of the plea put forth by his community. The High Court reversed the decision of the Lower Court and Mr. VIRCHAND thus achieved his second great triumph in the cause of his community. It is needless to say that the whole Jain community felt grateful to their young and enthusiastic co-religionist. Mr. VIRCHAND returned to his desk and murky legal folios in BOMBAY, but soon felt that his vocation lay in another direction. While his mind was

thus vacillating between law and the service of his community, His Holiness Munee Shri ATMARAMJEE, the wellknown JAIN PRIEST, received an invitation from the President of the Religious Congress, which was proposed to be held at CHICAGO, to represent Jainism. His Holiness, however, could not personally respond to the invitation on account of the many objections of Jain monks to cross the *Kala Pani* and so he referred the question to the Jain Association of INDIA. As was to be expected, everybody thought of Mr. VIRCHAND, who was ultimately elected as a delagate to represent Jainism at the great Parliament of the World's Religions to be held in AMERICA. After his election the young man spent some time at the feet of His Holiness Munee Shri ATMARAMJEE in order to have the benefit of that learned man's erudition and philosophical learning before starting for the land of WASHINGTON. Soon afterwards he sailed for CHICAGO. For a young man it was a stupendous task which Mr. GANDHI had undertaken. The Congress he was going to attend was not a political meeting where hackneyed platitudes or well-balanced periods were to be delivered. It was a religious congress and the keenest and most philosophical brains from all parts of the world were to take part in it. To face such an intellectual audience

and to uphold before it the dignity, the grandeur, the sublimity of his own beloved Jain religion was no ordinary undertaking for so young a man and would have taxed the abilities even of a veteran. How well young VIRCHAND acquitted himself of his responsible duty the following extract taken from the writings of an eminent American will show. Says this American:—

“A number of distinguished Hindu scholars, philosophers and religious teachers attended and addressed the Parliament; some of them taking rank with the highest of any race for learning, eloquence and piety. But it is safe to say that no one of the oriental scholars was listened to with greater interest than was this young layman of the Jain Community as he declared the Ethics and Philosophy of his people.”

The young man made such a deep impression upon the organisers of the Congress that they presented him with a silver Medal. What was more significant, however, was the impression he made upon the general public, some idea of which can be formed from the fact that the people of Casadoga presented him with a Gold Medal. Mr. VIRCHAND'S Mission to AMERICA did not conclude with the sitting of the Congress. At the desire as well as at the expense of some of the

leading Jain merchants of BOMBAY, he remained in that continent for three years for diffusing among the Americans some knowledge of the philosophy of Jainism. He delivered a series of illuminating lectures in important centres like CHICAGO, BOSTON, NEW YORK and WASHINGTON. He was cordially received every where and his speeches left a very happy impression upon the minds of the American public about the sublimity of the Jain religion. He established there the GANDHI Philosophical Society and afterwards left for ENGLAND. Here also he delivered a number of discourses on the fundamental principles of Jainism under the presidency of that distinguished educationist Lord REAY, with whom he had come into contact when the former was Governor of BOMBAY. In England, too, Mr. GANDHI made a great impression and several eminent gentlemen requested him to prolong his stay there and to initiate them into the philosophy of his ancient religion. Circumstances, however, made any prolonged stay in the Land of our Rulers impossible and so after travelling through some of the leading Continental countries he returned to his beloved motherland in June 1895. He was accorded a cordial reception on his arrival in BOMBAY by his co-religionists. After his return he further devoted himself to the study of Jaina philosophy in particular and generally

to that of the other great religions of the world. He also started in BOMBAY a new institution under the name of "HEMCHANDRACHARYA CLASS" before which he gave a course of lectures on such diverse subjects as the " Doctrine of Karma, " " Re-incarnation. " "Matter and spirit" and "Ultimate Principles." He also delivered many other discourses under the auspices of institutions like the "Budhiwardhak sabha" the Arya-samaj" and the "Theosophical Society." While thus conducting a vigorous campaign in the interests of Jainism he was several times earnestly requested by many of his American friends to pay them another visit. He accepted the invitation and started a second time for AMERICA in 1896. On this occasion he divided his time between England and the United States lecturing and holding classes in the latter country for six months, and keeping terms for six months at one of the Inns of Court in ENGLAND in order to qualify himself for the Bar. From these varied activities he was again called back to INDIA by his co-religionists. An appeal had to be made to the Secretary of state in several matters affecting the interests of the Jain community and it was felt by all that Mr. VIRCHAND was the only man to undertake the work. This time, however his stay in INDIA was very short-about three weeks only. But even in that short time his phenomenal energy

enabled him to collect all the necessary information and material to substantiate his case before the Secretary of State, and shortly afterwards he again went to ENGLAND this time accompanied by his son MOHANLAL. He did the needful in the matter of the Appeal and was called to the Bar in 1901. Soon afterwards he returned to his native land with a heart full of hope and a determination to devote all his life to the service of his co-religionists and country. But, truly, "man proposes and God disposes." Little did the comparatively young man dream that INDIA at the news of Mr. GANDHI'S tragically premature his Pilgrimage on Earth had almost come to an end. "Quiet," says the Poet, "to quick bosoms is a Hell." The same was the case with Mr. GANDHI. His spirit was too volcanic to allow him ever to think of rest. From his youth upwards his brain and mind were always working at high pressure and the frail body proved too weak to long sustain the phenomenal activity of the man. He returned to India but a mere shadow of his former self, a total physical wreck. Only two weeks after he landed at BOMBAY the end came on the 7th of August, 1901; he had returned to his native country only to die. A thrill almost of horror passed through the Jain community all over



demise. But of what avail are such vain regrets! He had played his short but eventful part on the stage of this world, tried to fulfil what he thought to be his mission, and left "for that bourne from which no traveller returns," leaving behind him for his community and his countrymen in general the noble example of a useful and unblemished life, of what amount of enduring work can be concentrated within the brief span of 37 years. May his soul rest in eternal peace and continue to inspire his co-religionists and countrymen with high ideals is the only prayer of the humble writer of this brief notice of the life of a man who may truly be said to have fulfilled the noblest ideals of citizenship and manhood.

"Jain" office.  
 Fort, Bombay.  
*27 September 1907.*

} BHAGU F. KARBHARI.

# CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
The philosophy and ethics of Jainism...	1
The History and tenents of the Jains of India...	8
Jainism at Chicago (speech)...	11
Philosophy and Psychology of the Jains...	14
What is Jainism ... ..	24
How to study Jain Philosophy ... ..	29
The occult law of sacrifice...	30
Jainism ... ..	41
Have Christian Missions to India been successful?...	60
Symbolism ... ..	95
Wonderful feats of memory ... ..	116
Essential Philosophy of Hinduism, Buddhism and Jainism... ..	125
The true Laws of Life... ..	156
Karma ... ..	181
The Science of eating...	186
Astral vision... ..	200
Ancient India ... ..	221
Jainism ... ..	228
Contribution of Jainism to Philosophy, History and Progress ... ..	230
Man's relation to the universe...	251
India's Message to America...	256
Impressions of America ... ..	273
Some mistakes corrected ... ..	290
Another Indian religion ... ..	328
Appendix ... ..	331
Proceedings of the East India Association ...	336

**“ Non-iniury is the highest religion. ”**

**“ Non-injury means cessation of evil. ”**

# Jaina Philosophy.

---

Mr. Virchand R. Gandhi at the  
Chicago Parliament of  
Religions.

---

## THE PHILOSOPHY AND ETHICS OF THE JAINS.

---

Jainism has two ways of looking at things—one called *Dravyarthikanaya* and the other *Paryayarthikanaya*. According to the *Dravyarthikanaya* view the universe is without beginning and end but according to the *Paryayarthika* view we have creation and destruction at every moment.

The Jain cannon may be divided into two parts. First *Shruta Dharma i. e.* Philosophy, and second, *Charitra Dharma i. e.* Ethics.

The *Shruta Dharma* inquires into the nature of nine principles, six kinds of living beings and four states of existence. Of the nine principles, the first is soul. According to the Jain view soul is that element which knows, thinks and feels. It is in fact the divine element in the living being. The Jain thinks that phenomena of knowledge, feeling, thinking and willing are conditioned on something, and that that something must be as real as anything can be. This "soul" is in a certain sense different from knowledge and in another sense identical with it. So far as one's knowledge is concerned, the soul is identical with it, but so far as some one else's knowledge is concerned, it is different from it. The true nature of soul is right knowledge, right faith and right conduct. The soul, so long as it is subject to transmigration, is undergoing evolution, and ivolution.

The second principle is non-soul. It is not simply what we understand by matter, but it is more than that. Matter is a term contrary to soul. But non-soul is its contradictory. Whatever is not soul is non-soul.

The rest of the nine principles are but the different states produced by the combination and separation of soul and non-soul. The third principle is merit, that on account of which a being is happy. The fourth principle is demerit, that on account of which a being suffers from misery. The fifth is the

state which brings in merit and demerit. The sixth is *samvara* that which stops the inflow of foreign energies. The seventh is distruction of actions The eighth is bondage of soul, with actions. The ninth is total and permanent freedom of soul from all actions.

Substance is divided into the sentient, or conscious, matter *dharmastikaya* ( fulcrum of motion ) *adharmastikaya* ( fulcrum of stability, or rest ) space and time Six kinds of living beings are divided into six classes.—earth-body beings, water-body beings, fire-body beings, wind-body beings, and vegetables, all of them having one organ of sense, that of touch, and animals These animals are again divided into four classes —beings having two organs of sense, those of touch and of taste, such as tape worms leeches &c, beings having three organs of sense, those of taste touch and smell; such as ants, lice &c, beings having four organs of sense, those of touch, taste, smell and sight, such as bees, scorpons, &c ; beings having five organs of sense, those of touch, taste, smell, sight and hearing These are human beings, animals, birds, men and gods All these living beings have four, five or six of the following capacities;—capacity of taking food, capacity of constructing body, capacity of constructing organs, capacity of respiration, capacity of speaking and the capacity of thinking Beings having one organ of sence *i. e.* of touch, have the first four capacities Beings having two, three and

four organs of sense, have the first five capacities, while those having five organs have all the six capacities.

The Jain canonical books treat very elaborately of the minute divisions of the living beings, and their prophets have long before the discovery of the microscope been able to tell how many organs of sense the minutest animalcule has. I would refer those who are desirous of studying Jain biology, zoology, botany anatomy, and physiology to the many books published by our society \*

I shall now refer to the four states of existence. They are *naraka*, *tiryanch manushya*, and *deva*. *Naraka* is the lowest state of existence, that of being a denizen of hell; *tiryanch* is next, that of having an earth body, a waterbody, a firebody, a wind-body of being a vegetable and lastly animals, and birds, which are again divided into four classes of having two three four or five senses. The third is *manushya* the state of being a man and the fourth is *deva*, that of being a denizen of the Celestial world. The highest state of existence is the *Jian Moksha*, apotheosis in the sense that the mortal being by the destruction of all *karman* attains the highest severed spiritualism, and the soul being severed from all connection with matter gains its purest state and becomes divine.

---

\* Such books are in *Sanskrit* or *Prakrit*. Ed.

Having briefly stated the principal articles of Jain belief, I come to the *great* questions, the answers to which are the objects of all religious inquiry and the substance of all creeds

*What is the origin of the Universe ?*

This involves the question of God. Gautama, the Buddha, forbids inquiry into the beginning of things. In the *Brahmanical literature* bearing on the constitution of cosmos frequent reference is made to the days and nights of *Brahma*, the periods of *Manvantara* and the periods of *Pralaya*. But the Jains, leaving all symbolical expression aside distinctly reaffirm the view previously promulgated by the previous hierophants, that matter and soul are eternal and cannot be created. You can affirm existence of a thing from one point of view, deny it from another and affirm both existence and non-existence with reference to it at different times. If you should think of affirming both existence and non-existence at the same time from the same point of view, you must say that the thing cannot be spoken of similarly. Under certain circumstances the affirmation of existence is not possible, of non-existence and also of both.

What is meant by these seven modes is that a thing should not be considered as existing everywhere at all times, in all ways, and in the form of everything. It may exist in one place and not in another at one time. It is not meant by these modes that



there is no certainty or that we have to deal with probabilities only as some scholars have taught. Even the great *Vedantist Sankaracharya* has possibly erred when he says that the Jains are agnostics. All that is implied is that every assertion which is true, is true only under certain conditions of substance, space, time etc.

This is the great merit of the Jain Philosophy, that while other philosophies make absolute assertions, the Jain looks at things from all standpoints, and adapts itself like a mighty ocean in which the sectarian rivers merge themselves. *What is God then ?* God, in the sense of an extra cosmic personal creator, has no place in the Jain philosophy. It distinctly denies such creator, as illogical and irrelevant in the general scheme of the universe. But it lays down that there is a subtle essence underlying all substances, conscious as well as unconscious, which becomes an enternal cause of all modifications and is termed God.

The doctrine of the transmigration of soul or the reincarnation, is another grand idea of the Jain philosophy. The companion doctrine of transmigration is the doctrine of *Karma*. The *Sanskrit* of the word '*Karma*' means action. "With what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again," and "whatsoever a man soweth, that shall be also reaped," are but the corollaries of that most intricate

law of *Karman*. It solves the problem of the inequality and apparent injustice of the world. The *Karman* in the Jain philosophy is divided into eight classes. Those which act as an impediment to the knowledge of truth, those which act as an impediment to the right insight of various sorts; those which give one pleasure and pain, and those which produce bewilderment. The other four are again divided into other classes, so minutely that a student of Jain *Karman philosophy* can trace any effect to a Particular *Karma*. No other Indian philosophy reads so beautifully and so clearly the doctrine of *Karmas*. Persons who by right faith, right knowledge and right conduct, destroy all *Karmas* and thus fully develop the nature of their soul, reach the highest perfection, become divine and are called *Jinas*. Those *Jinas* who, in every age, preach the law and establish the order, are called *Tirthankaras*.

2. I now come to the Jain ethics, which direct conduct to be so adapted as to insure the fullest development of the soul—the highest happiness, that is the goal of human conduct, which is the ultimate end of human action. Jainism teaches to look upon all living beings as upon oneself. What then is the mode of attaining the highest happiness? The sacred books of the *Brahmans* prescribe devotion and *Karma*. The *Vedanta* indicates the path of knowledge as the means to the highest. But Jainism goes a step farther and says that the highest happiness is to be

obtained by knowledge and religious observances. The five *Mahavratas* or great commandments for Jain ascetics are not to kill i. e. to protect all life; not to lie; not to take that which is not given; to abstain from sexual intercourse; to renounce all interest in worldly things especially to call nothing one's own.

---

## The History and Tenents of the Jains of India.

---

Mr. Gandhi prefaced his paper with remarks in reference to the allegations of the previous day against the morality of the Hindu religion He said:—

“I am glad that no one has dared to attack the religion I represent. It is well they should not. But every attack has been directed to the abuses existing in our society. And I repeat now, what I repeat every day, that these abuses are not from religion but in spite of religion, as in every other country Some men in their ambition think that they are Pauls and what they think they believe, and where should these new Pauls go to vent their platitudes but India? Yes Sir, they go to India to convert the heathen in a mass but when they find their dreams melting away, as dreams always do, they return back to pass a whole life in abusing the

Hindu. Abuses are not arguments against any religion nor self adulation the proof of the truth of one's own. For such I have the greatest pity. There are a few Hindu temples in Southern India where women singers are employed to sing on certain occasions. Some of them are of dubious character, and the Hindu Society feels it and is trying its best to remove the evil. These women are never allowed to enter the main body of the temple and as for their being priestesses, there is not one woman priest from the Himalay to Cape Comorin

If the present abuses in India have been produced by the Hindu religion the same religion had the strength of producing a society which made the Greek Historian say, "No Hindu was ever known to tell an untruth, no Hindu woman ever known to be unchaste," and even in the present day, where is the chaster woman or milder man than in India?

In the last place I am very, very sorry for those who criticise the great ones of India, and my only consolation is that all their information about them has come from third hand, or fourth hand sources, percolating through layers of superstition and bigotry. To those who find in the refusal of the Hindu to criticise the character of Jesus tacit acceptance of the superiority of the final nil admiracult they represent, I am

tempted to quote the old fable of Æsop and tell them "Not to you I bend the knee but to the image you are carrying on your back;" and to point out to them one page from the life of the great Emperor Akbar.

A certain ship full of Mahommedan pilgrims was going to Mecca. On its way a Portuguese vessel captured it, amongst the booty were some copies of the *Koran*. The Portuguese hanged these copies of the *Koran* round the necks of dogs and paraded these dogs through the streets of Ormuz. It happened that this very Portuguese ship was captured by the emperor's men, and in it were found some copies of the *Bible*.

The love of Akbar for his mother is well-known and his mother was a zealous Mahommedan. It pained her very much to hear of the treatment of the sacred book of the Mahommedans in the hands of Christians and she wished that Akbar would do the same with the *Bible*, but this great man replied, "Mother, these ignorant men do not know the value of the *Koran*, and they treated it in a manner which is the outcome of ignorance. But I know the glory of the *Koran* and the *Bible* both and I can not debase myself in the way they did."

Mr. Gandhi's remarks were followed by expressions of sympathy from among the audience

\*

\*

\*

\*

---

The afternoon session opened with a few words of cordial and hopeful salutation from Dr. Carl von Bergen of Sweden after which Mr. Virchand Gandhi, a lawyer of Bombay and one of the chief exponents of the Jain religion of that country spoke as follows:

### Speech of Mr Gandhi

“Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen,—I will not trouble you with a long speech I, like my respected friends, Mr. Mazoomdar and others, come from India the motherland of religions. I represent Jainism, a faith older than Buddhism, similar to it in its ethics, but different from it in its psychology and professed by a million and a half of India's most peaceful and law abiding citizens. You have heard so many speeches from eloquent members and as I shall speak later on at some length, I will, at present, only offer on behalf of my community and their high priest **Muni-Atma Ramji**, whom I especially represent here, our sincere thanks for the kind welcome you have given us

This spectacle of the learned leaders of thought and religion meeting together on a common platform, and throwing light on religious problems, has been the dream of **Atma Ramji's** life, he has commissioned me to say to you that he offers his most cordial congratulations on his own behalf, and on behalf

of the Jain community for your having achieved the consummation of that grand idea, of convening a Parliament of religions."

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr Virchand Gandhi then was presented by Dr. Barrows as one whom he had come to esteem greatly as a guest in his own household. Mr Gandhi was greeted with much applause as he came forward to speak. He said.

"Are we not all sorry that we are parting so soon? Do we not wish this Parliament would last seventeen times seventeen days? Have we not heard with pleasure and interest the speeches of the learned representatives on this platform? Do we not see that the sublime dream of the organisers of this unique Parliament has been more than realised? If you will only permit a heathen to deliver his message of peace and love, I shall only ask you to look at the multifarious ideas presented to you in a liberal spirit, and not with superstition and bigotry, as the seven blind men did in the elephant story

Once upon a time in a great city an elephant was brought with a circus. The people had never seen an elephant before. There were seven blind men in the city who longed to know what kind of an animal it was, so they went together to the place where the elephant was kept. One of them placed his hand on

the ears, another on the legs, a third on the tail of the elephant and so on. When they were asked by the people what kind of an animal the elephant was. One of the blind men said, "Oh, to be sure, the elephant is like a big winnowing fan."

Another blind man said, "No, my dear sir, you are wrong. The elephant is more like a big, round post." The third, "You are quite mistaken, it is like a tapering stick." The rest of them gave also their different opinions. The proprietor of the circus stepped forward and said; "My friends, you are all mistaken. You have not examined the elephant from all sides. Had you gone so you would not have taken one sided views."

Brothers and sisters, I entreat you to hear the moral of this story and learn to examine the various religious systems from all standpoints.

I now thank you from the bottom of my heart, for the kindness with which you have received us and for the liberal spirit and patience with which you have heard us. And to you, Reverend Dr. Barrows and President Bonny, we owe the deepest gratitude for the hospitality which you have extended to us."

\*

\*

\*

\*

\*





## Philosophy and Psychology of the Jains.\*

**I**n the concluding paragraph of the Prospectus of MIND I find the following suggestive words: "While granting due credit to Hindu metaphysics and the mysticism of the Orient in general, we are yet inclined to look for the development of a Western Psychology that will harmonize with the conditions of life in the Occident, at the same time tending to promote the spiritual welfare of the race as a whole." This statement seems to whisper in my ears that "Hindu" metaphysics has not been able to offer the right solution of the various intricate problems of life that are staring in the face of the Western thinker. By "Hindu" is meant, of course, the special phase of *Vedanta* philosophy that has been presented to the people of the West during the last four years

I am glad that the truth in *Vedanta* has come to the shores of this country. It would have been much better, however, if the *whole* truth lying back of the different sectarian systems of India had been presented, so that a complete instead of a partial view of India's wisdom might have satisfied the craving of deep students. But the history of the religious and philosophic progress of the world shows that sectarianism takes a long time to be transmuted into universalism, and so we shall have to wait.

---

\* Reprinted from Mind Vol 1. No. 4

Besides "Hindu" or *Vedic metaphysics*, there are systems in India not based on the *Vedas* and *Upanishads*, and are therefore classed as heterodox by the *Vedists*, who, however, it must be admitted to their credit, do not consign them to the "uncovenanted mercies of God," as some Christian sects have done. These are the Buddhist and Jain systems. Much has been written and spoken on Buddhism, but very little on Jainism. In this article, therefore, I intend to present a short sketch of the latter, in the hope that Hindu metaphysics may receive proper consideration in the Occident.

"Jain" (or, more properly speaking, "Jaina") means a follower of *Jina*, which is a generic term applied to those persons (*men and women*) that have conquered the lower nature—passion, hatred, and the like—and brought into prominence the highest. The Jain philosophy, therefore, bases its doctrine on the absolute necessity (for the realization of truth) of conquering the lower nature. To the undeveloped or insufficiently developed observer, it is the conquering of the lower nature; to the fully developed, it is the realization of the perfect.

There lived many such *Jinas* in the past, and many will doubtless yet be born. The philosophy of the Jains, therefore, is not essentially founded on any particular writing or external revelation, but on the unfoldment of spiritual consciousness, which is

the birthright of every soul. Books, writings, and scriptures may illustrate, wholly or in part, this truth; but the ultimate fact remains that no mere words can give full expression to the truths of Jainism which must be felt and realized within.

I have been often asked, " What is the origion of the universe, according to the Jain view ? " We might as well ask: What is the origin of Being ? What is the source of God? etc. Philosophy in the primitive state ( logically, not chronologically ) postulates an external, simple substance from which it attempts to explain the multiplicity of the complex. Philosophy in this sense assumes various forms All of them attempt to interpret the law of causation, and in that attempt many, fatigued after the long mental strain, stop at some one thing, element, or principle ( physical or metaphysical ) beyond which they have not mentally the ability to go. Some ( for instance, the Ionic philosophers ) called it water, fire, or air.

The *Sankhya* philosophy, in India, tried to explain evolution and even cosmic consciousness and the growth of organs, etc., as proceeding from the simple substance called *Prakriti*, or primordial matter. Modern science evolves all life from the simple protoplasm. In tracing every effect to a cause, when these philosophers stop at something they contradict themselves by not extending and applying the law of causation

to what they call the "first principle." Dr. Paul Deussen, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Kiel, in Germany, very truly says, with reference to Causality ( " Elements of Metaphysics " ) : " As space and time are without limits, so also the net of causality is necessarily without beginning or end ; " and he gives the following demonstration :

"(a) If it were not without beginning, we should have to assume a first state of things. In order that this state might develop, a change would have to occur in it, which change would itself again be the effect of a foregoing change," etc.\*

"(b) The chain of causality is without end, in as-much as no change can take place at any time without proceeding as an effect from its sufficient cause. "

Jain philosophy, therefore, is not the doctrine of illusion, nor of emanation, nor of creation. It is rather the doctrine that teaches the inexpugnability of various properties inextricably combined in a thing. Hence, the affirmation of only one property would be true so far as one side of the question is concerned, but it becomes false when it rejects other sides—implying thereby that the very existence of

---

\*This is the rock on which splits the cosmological argument, which confounds the metaphysical principle of salvation (God) with the physical principle of creation.

that particular side depends on the existence of other sides Jainism emphasizes at the same time the fact that at any particular moment it is impossible to express in words this complexity of truth (though possible to realize it in consciousness), for words always take for expression more moments than one.

This teaching is also known as the doctrine of many sidedness (अनेकांतवाद) For instance, the universe is eternal as well as non-eternal If the manifestations, modifications, developments, and activities are left out of consideration, what remains of the universe is eternal If merely those modifications, etc., are taken into consideration, that side of the universe (which is not a different *thing* from the universe, but only a different *aspect*), is non-eternal That is the only way of coming to a correct understanding and definite knowledge

Sankaracharya, commentator of the *Vedanta-sutras*, has fallen into a great error when he states that the Jain doctrine should not be accepted because "it is impossible that contradictory attributes, such as being and non-being, should at the same time belong to one and the same thing, just as observation teaches us that a thing cannot be hot and cold at the same moment." The Jains do *not* teach that a thing can be hot and cold at the same moment. But they *do* teach that a thing cannot be hot absolu-

tely, and cannot be cold absolutely; it is hot under certain definite circumstances, and cold under others. The Jains do *not* teach that being and non-being (of itself) should at the same time belong to one and the same thing. What they teach is that in a thing there is being (of itself) and non-being (of other things), which means that a thing can be fully known only by knowing what it *is* and what it is *not*. Sankara, in fact, creates a man of straw, imputes to him certain imaginary doctrines, and by refuting them he knocks him down. That is his glory.

Let us now see what the Jains have to say about the *Vedic systems* of philosophy. Guna-ratna, Suri, the commentator of a Jain work on "Comparative Philosophy," says.

"Although the various schools of philosophy, through sectarian bigotry, differ from and contradict one another, still there are certain aspects of truth in them which would harmonize if they were joined [into an organic whole]. For instance, the Buddhists advocate momentariness of things, the *Sankhyas* maintain eternity. *Narayana* and *Vaiseshikas* believe in independent eternalities and non-eternalities, being and non-being, community and difference, and eternity of the Word. The *Mimamsakas* affirm eternity and non-eternity, separateness and identity, being and non-being, community and difference, and the eternity of the Word. Some postu-

tate either Time, Nature, Necessity, *Karma*, or *Purusha* as the origin of the Universe; and the *Monists*, who advocate the doctrine of Word-Brahma-Gnosis, believe in their identity. The different aspects of truth accepted by these sectarians, when related to one another, all together become one *grand truth*; but, if they do not join hands, they contradict one another, and in so doing they are changed into "the flower of the sky" [which is not a real thing, but an illusion of the mind] "

The Jain philosophy teaches that the universe—the totality of realities—is infinite in space and eternal in time, but the same universe, considered from the stand-point of the manifestations of the different realities, is finite in space and non-eternal in time. Particular parts of the universe have their cyclic laws corresponding to the laws of evolution and involution. At certain periods *Arhats*, or great Masters [Saviors of mankind], are born, who through love, sacrifice of the lower nature (not of the real Self), and wisdom, teach the true doctrine. Referring to that part of the world known as Bharata-Khanda (India), the last *Arhat*, Mahavira, was born 598 B. C., in a town called Kundagrama in the territory of Videha. He lived seventy-two years and reached *Moksha* [the perfect condition] in 526 B. C.

The Jain philosophy also teaches that each soul (*Atman*) is a separate individuality, uncreated, and eternal in existence; that each individual soul has

lived from time without beginning in some embodied state, evolving from the lower to the higher condition through the law of *Karma*, or cause and effect; that so long as the *Karmas*, (forces generated in previous lives) have not been fully worked out, it has, after physical death, to form another body, until through evolutionary processes it unfolds its absolute purity. Its full perfection is then manifested. This perfection of the individuality is the *Jain Nirvana* or *Mukti*. The individuality is not merged into anything; neither is it annihilated. The process of this development, or salvation, may be said simply to consist in right realization, right knowledge, and right life, the details of which are many.

I will now say a few words about Jain Psychology. There are five Gateways of Knowledge, all unfolding through the laws of evolution and *Karma*. The first is the senses. In the lowest form of life, there is only one sense—that of touch. In higher forms of life, there are two, three, four, and (as in animals, birds, fish and men) five senses. Through the senses a limited form of knowledge is unfolded. The second source is study and reading. The third is *Avadhi*, or the psychic faculty, through which finer and more subtle things are known. The fourth is mind-knowing, by which the mental processes of others



are known and understood.\* The fifth is Absolute Knowledge, in which all limitations of body and brain are removed. This state is not a loss, but rather the acme, of consciousness.

All these stages come to the ego not of themselves but through persistent effort and exercise of free will, or rather by making the will freer and freer. Personality is the mere physical but subtle gathering of accretions through which the individuality becomes unfolded. Personality is therefore changing every moment; the individuality is for every moment the particular stage of unfoldment of the ego itself, and is consequently the bearer of the sins and sorrows, pleasures and enjoyments, of mundane life. In absolute perfection this bearing nature is thrown off like a husk, and the ego dwells in divine and eternal bliss. It is not destroyed nor is it merged into another ego or in a Supreme Being; and if the question be asked whether in this state of *Mukti* (deliverance) there is one ego or a plurality of egos, I would answer in the words of the Jain Master. "That *Atman* by which I experienced myself and my essence through self-realization—that I am neither masculine, feminine, nor neuter, neither one, two, nor many "

---

\*This is not to be confounded with telepathy or direct thought-transference, in which a conscious relation has to be established between the agent and the recipient, since in genuine mind-knowing the developed man knows the mental activities of others without their trying to communicate them to him

Now I come back to the quotation with which I began this article. The Vedanta metaphysics teaches that salvation comes through knowledge (of Brahman). It is not the potential that through effort and conquest becomes the actual; and we are further taught that that which *is* is real *now*. On the other hand, Jainism teaches that from the ideal and transcendental standpoint you *are* Brahman, but its eternality, the real *Mukti*, comes from work and knowledge together, not from one alone. Through work and knowledge, Jainism says, the individual develops and unfolds the potential; therefore, the statement, "I am Brahman," would be interpreted by a Jain to mean—I am Brahman only inherently, or in embryo, I have the capacity or the actual possibility of Brahman, what I am implicitly must become explicit. There is a vast difference between the implicit and the explicit. Those who do not recognize this difference would never make an attempt to become rational and free.

The doctrine of the Jains known as *Syadvada* or *Anekanta-vada*, it is proper to affirm, in the words of a writer in America —

' is competent to descend into the utmost minutiae of metaphysics and to settle all the vexed questions of abstruse speculation by a positive method (not merely asserting *na iti, na iti* not so, not so)—to settle at any rate the limits of what it is possible to determine by any method which the human mind may be rationally supposed to possess. It promises to reconcile

all the conflicting schools, not by inducing any of them necessarily to abandon their favorite 'standpoints,' but by proving to them that the standpoints of all others are alike tenable; or, at least, that they are representative of some aspect of truth which under some modification needs to be represented; and that the Integrality of Truth consists in this very variety of its aspects within the relational unity of an all comprehensive and ramifying principle."

---

## What is Jainism? \*

---

The opinions of scholars are divided as to the antiquity of the Jainism faith; many claiming that is older than Brahminism Gautama Sakyamuni mentioned Jainism. He said; "I hear that many Jain monks received hospitality from you, and you must continue to furnish it to them" He spoke to them as *Nigunta-tieless*—they have no money; they are homeless wanderers as Jesus was He would have been called Jain if he had lived in India.

Jain is generic as Christ. We believe that there is not one Christ but many Christs born in all countries.

---

\* This lecture contains only, notes taken by a pupil while lecturing on the subject. Ed.

Jainism means any person who has conquered passion, and one who follows these principles is called a Jain.

This philosophy of Jainism is not a monistic theory except in the last analysis. There is nothing in the universe but substance, but there are many kinds of substances. Existence cannot be separated from substance. We are dualists. We say there is spirit and matter, while the positivists, and monists in this country say there is but one substance. Theosophists say spirit and matter are opposite poles of the same substance. We say no, spirit can never be matter. Matter is known by the senses, spirit only by spirit. The Greeks said "Know thyself by thyself."

The highest knowledge is that which you derive simply by the power of the soul.

Spirit is that whose attribute or differentia is consciousness, that which knows is soul; that which does not know is non-soul. People often confuse motion with life. We say these forces, such as cohesion etc are different from life. They are concurrent things, but not the same. This consciousness appears in many forms.

We divide organic beings into five classes; those that have one sense, and those that have two, three, four and five senses.

Consciousness is found in all these. The lowest is that found in the beings that have only the organ of touch. The reason why these organs of sense are found inherent in the law of ethical causation.

Not that consciousness becomes human (describing the difference in souls the speaker used this illustration) put a dollar into the pocket of a rich man or a poor man It is the same dollar although it may be spent for an entirely different purpose So a soul in a plant body, an animal body, or a human body may be the same soul. There is no idea of transmigration in the Hindu philosophy; also re-incarnation is not correct (The speaker explained how the exact use of these terms was not correct) if embodiment means taking on the body, then it is correct We use the term re-birth Re-birth is to be avoided We must act so as to be regenerated in this life When I do an act or think a thought, I create debts or forces which I must pay on the same plane When you create debts on a physical plane you must pay them on a physical plane Soul life is on the moral plane Life may be divided into the physical, intellectual, moral and spiritual planes. When a person is on the lowest plane he depends on gross matter for all his acts and powers If he wishes to progress he must follow the rules pertaining to that life We do not despise the physical life He must act so that the physical will correspond with the laws of the other planes Body is not the

temple of the soul, but a helper (The speaker gave an illustration of two enemies who were fastened in the stocks One was rich and had food furnished him but could not partake of it unless fed by the other ) The key-note of our philosophy is, that body is to be taken care of only so far as it helps the spirit Religion is with the Hindus not a sectional part but dominates all life. (In describing the Hindu theory, he said "in such a philosophy there is no necessity of any ethical code " )

( Much here is missed showing the distinction between the Hinduism and Jainism ) (We say spirit has always been spirit, when it separates itself from matter it would live in the highest state) ?

There is no limit to the number of souls There are an infinite number Take out of an infinite number an infinite number, and an infinite number will remain In the space occupied by the point of a needle there are many souls, and no matter how many are taken out an infinite number remains

God to us would mean to have attained the perfect and liberated state We pay homage to the perfect for the sake of perfection, and not for any reward One of the prayers of the Jain is " I worship with power all consciousness which becomes the leader for us on the path of salvation; which has broken to pieces the mountain of physical forces or *Karma*; which has acquired omniscience " I worship these because I wish to become that power

There is not a native Buddhist in all India.

Hinduism has borrowed Buddhistic ideas, and is now a mixture of the old Vedic faith with other philosophies.

Mind is a relationship established between the soul and body, which is the action of the soul along a certain line.

No soul is disembodied unless it is liberated. Out philosophy teaches that the liberated soul can exist without form and without space, and has the highest consciousness of power, life, etc. Souls who die assume a body, but not an earthly body for they are liberated. We do not believe in materialism. We believe that spirits may appear as a vision, but we insist upon three conditions as necessary. First, that the vision appears a foot above the floor; second, it must appear in broad day light; third, it must not cast a shadow. [Being questioned, the speaker replied: "I, myself, have seen such a vision."] The spirits which appear are usually those of spirits which cannot get away from earthly ties. Affection limits them to an earthly plane. Being asked about recognizing friends who thus appear, he said That the soul on an earthly plane recognizes only limited relationship, but if it passed to the higher plane it recognized universal relationship. [To a question, he replied that the spirit could return as a ministering spirit.]

---

## How to study Jain Philosophy.

---

The Jain philosophy has been stumbling block to many a scholar Eastern and Western. Modern students are accustomed to think in the popular way known as the scientific way—the way common to the various sciences of the day. “It is the way with them” as Prof William Wallace says “to assume that the student has a rough general image, of the objects which they examine; and under the guidance or with the help of this generalised image, they go on to explain and describe its outlines more completely. They start with an approximate conception, such as any body may be supposed to have, and thus they seek to render more definite.—The geologist for example, could scarcely teach geology, unless he could pre-suppose or produce some acquaintance on the part his pupils with what Hume would have called an “Impression” or an “idea” of the rocks and formations of which he has to treat. The geometer gives a short, and, as it were, popular explanation of the sense in which angles, circles, triangles &c. are to be understood. and then by the aid of these provisional definitions we come to a more scientific notion of the same terms. The third book of Euclid, for example, brings before us a clearer notion of what a circle is, than the nominal explanation in the list of definitions. By means of these temporary aids, or as we may call them, lead-



ing-strings for the intellect, the progress of the ordinary scientific student is made tolerably easy." This is the scientific method of study. Never in this method is brought into prominence the necessity of psychological and ethical improvement of the mind which wishes to study the great problems of life and the universe. Self restraint, the first step in acquiring true knowledge, sacrifice of the cherished habits of mind, giving up of *Drishti-raga*, as we Jains call it, which are in our opinion the *sine qua non* of full and clear understanding of the self and the non-self, are seldom taken into consideration in the Western method of thinking.

This vice of the popular method of thinking is specially apparent in religious propagandists and political leaders. Their idols symbolised in certain words remain always unflinching. Atheism, Fatherhood of God.

---

## The Occult Law of Sacrifice.

---

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

The Western scholars and scientific men of the modern age draw a demarkation line between animals and men, and we are told that animals are only *conscious*, while human beings are *self conscious*. *Self consciousness* is supposed to be the naturally inherited

property of every human being—that animals have only the consciousness of feelings through sensations but that they have no consciousness of their own individual existence, while human beings, in addition to the consciousness of the external world through feelings and thoughts have also a consciousness of their own existence. This distinguishing mark of the human being is easy to understand in superficial thought but it leaves the question open, what is self-consciousness, or consciousness of the self? In fact, what is self. Materialistic science does not admit a self other than the body. Consciousness and self-consciousness, in this view, are merely the kaleidoscopic panorama—from the psychic side—of the various elements of the living body—elements that are changing every moment, replaced by others. According to this idea, man is a bundle of bones, muscles and nerves, whose chief and perhaps only function would be to store sensations, feelings and emotions. Man would, therefore, be very little different from the animal except in the supposed fact that in the human being an additional series of kaleidoscopic changes in the arrangement of the particles of the body is presented which is called self-consciousness. This is a very small credit given to the human stage of individual development. In that philosophy there can be no place for individual memory, as the incoming particles in the body can never come to know that, what was done ten years

ago by a certain multitude of particles, was actually done by them, if they were not there then. It does not answer in a satisfactory way the question—What is it that preserves unity amid the continuous changes that are going on all the time in the body? This unifying entity that is in every living thing is what the *Aryans* call the *Atman*, the soul. All living beings, therefore, are *Atman* material body not mixed up in a mechanical way as water and sugar are in syrup, but both of them phenomenally acting upon each other and creating important changes in each other. The similarity then between an animal and a human being lies in the fact that both are susceptible to hunger, sleep, fear and animal passions, but that which constitutes the special characteristic of the human being is that he can practice "*Dharma*" i. e., understand, realize and bring into operation the spiritual law of the universe which teaches him how to control his lower nature and bring into prominence the higher one. The human being is a *Dharmic* (and in that sense, religious) being.

How has he reached this stage? In one word, through the Law of Sacrifice. The first beginning of consciousness is made through the body and while in the "lowest" life there is only the body without organs of sense, even then, the finer the body is, the greater is the sensitiveness. The increase in consciousness and elevation in type take place by reason

of the grosser being sacrificed and the subtler coming into prominence. This does not necessarily take place in all beings, but not even the tiniest animalcule can elevate itself to the higher stage of life unless and until voluntarily or involuntarily it throws off the impurities and gathers the subtler forces. Involuntarily this is done even by human beings. A low man living in a cultured family unconsciously gives up much of his gross nature and brings himself up to the polished physical level of those with whom he lives. Domesticated animals are the best illustration of this law of sacrifice. And in all such cases, with the giving up of lower nature, the individual souls become equipped with finer forces that they can use for reaching greater heights.

Now, the student of humanity observing the different mental conditions of different men and women finds them divided into three classes. The lowest are those who are gross, immoral, sluggish and ignorant, the middle class consisting of men and women living only for the gratification of the senses, that is, pleasures of the world, eating, drinking, fine dress, etc., and the higher class made up of people that devote time and energy for spiritual good, the majority belonging to the second class. A person belonging to the lowest class desiring to elevate himself must make certain sacrifices, so also should one belonging to the second class. That which was formerly gross must now be ennobled. That which

was greed must now be transmuted into an unflinching will to accomplish the spiritual good. That which was passion and lust must now be changed into a burning love for all. But this change is to be accomplished through the Law of Sacrifice.

From these considerations the ancient sages of India made certain rules for people who naturally, in the stage which they had reached, would keep self-gratification as an end and aim of life; in whom, in fact, the lower nature was so strong and powerful that nothing would set them to work except a desire for the gratification of the sense. And looking around us to day we shall find that the majority of human beings are in that category. Few are the men and women whose life and conduct are purely based on altruistic motives, rare are the people in whom the thought of the little self does not control some of their acts and movements. Persons who have devoted their whole life to the service of humanity, aye, to the good of all living beings, are few and far between. And still the majority of human beings in whom the lower nature is more powerful can by degrees be elevated to a higher plane, where they can be taught to look upon life as a field for the performance of duty and not as an arena for self-gratification. This idea can be introduced in all departments of life. Just analyse the mental condition of the person who works for his own gratification. For everything that he does he wants a re-

ward. He wants a reward because there are still cause within him many desires controlling his very being. He has not yet mastered his lower nature, at times he becomes its slave. Now, in order to liberate him from this slavish condition, the wise men of the East prescribed certain rules for man. He was asked to do certain things, not hoping to reap fruit therefrom but in order simply to perform certain duties that he owed to the world. In this way step by step he can free himself from the shackles of animal desires and learn the truths of a higher degree. One of those rules was that he should perform every day five sacrifices. The first sacrifice was to the *Devas*, the shining powers and intelligences of the upper world. Everything that gives nourishment to the human body is by correspondence related to the subtle energies of other worlds, is in fact fed and nourished by those energies. Man is therefore under obligation to those forces and if he receives so much from them, let him give something in return, let him not be selfish. If his body is being vitalized by pure air let him do something that will make the surrounding atmosphere pure. If he is nourished by pure food let him offer certain oblations to those forces that supply purity to food; and so in everything let him give something in return, he will then feel the satisfaction of having done something for whatever benefit he received of others. He will feel that he is not a beggar nor a thief, but an honest and self-dependent person.

The second sacrifice is to be made to parents and ancestors. We owe so much to our parents. They have brought us up, fed and clothed us remained awake many a night to care for us in babyhood. It would be ungrateful on our part if we did not do anything in return for all the benefits we received from them. If they are alive and have grown old, let us take care of them and serve them in any way that is likely to do them good. After death let us keep their names fresh in our memory. In the human evolution they have played their part, let us reciprocate their work by its appreciation and by continuing what they have done so that there shall be no break in the upward evolution of the human race.

The third sacrifice was in favor of men—those who needed our help and care. Every man is a part of humanity and by helping a fellow man we help humanity. If the future salvation of man is based on love, it must be practical love, not a mere idea, and that love is to be carried out by actually helping those who need help. This sacrifice must necessarily put an end to the growing selfishness of man and by its constant performance, his mental attitude is so thoroughly changed in reference to the external world that the greatest anxieties and worries would not agitate him; in all the troubles and changes his mind would be perfectly calm and quiet and he will learn to

interpret and understand rationally the apparent injustice and inequalities of the world

The fourth sacrifice is to the animals. By protecting, feeding and taking care of animals we help their progress. On the ladder of evolution they occupy a lower step, but that does not justify us to destroy them. On the contrary, we owe a duty to them. They, as beasts of burden, have for ages been a constant and faithful aid to man in civilizing himself. Had it not been for the ox,<sup>or</sup> the horse, the camel and the elephant, mankind would have remained at a standstill. Had it not been for the sheep and goats, you and I could not have made ourselves warm by clothing made from their wool, and still how selfish must be those men and women who simply through force of habit and custom directly encourage the killing of these creatures and use their flesh as food. Let them stop for a moment to think how ungrateful they are when they use animal flesh as food. If mankind has received so many benefits from the animal kingdom, let us return them by being kindly to them, by taking care and attending those that are suffering.

The fifth sacrifice that man has to perform is for himself-by devoting some time, energy and money for study and spiritual benefit. It is the Higher Self of an individual that has made it possible to



elevate him from the archaic condition to the human condition. The gratitude which the individual owes to the Higher Self is boundless, and if he has reached the human stage which presents him with so many opportunities for unfolding its faculties, let him lose no time in making the best use of them. Let him devote some time every day for study, for reading, for concentration and for the perfect recognition of the Higher Self. Let him spend some money for books and for study. Let him help others in making it convenient for them to learn the higher truths. Let him assist those who are helping others. A person desiring by study to benefit himself without caring for his brethren is better than one who cares not to study at all, but under any circumstances let all people learn something about the higher possibilities within themselves. Knowledge is power, and every person that has a desire for real power must know—that is, must know if there are higher and more subtle forces that operate on and within us and shape in a measure our destiny, and then study their laws so that you can ultimately exercise a wise control over them. Possibilities of the human soul are infinite. Let him or her who has the slightest desire to know the inner capacities of the self, study that self, learn how to analyze his or her mind, so that by the knowledge acquired he or she can control the lower self and bring into prominence the higher one. In this way this sacrifice of time and money benefits the sacrificer, as well as others. Just think how

much we sacrifice by simply catering to our lower desires, emotions and caprices; such a sacrifice of money, time or energy does not really produce any spiritual benefit in return, we do it because of our slavish obedience to the customs and etiquette of an ever-changing society. If we sacrifice so much for pleasing "society" may we not have sufficient courage to ignore the opinions of those that have never thought of the higher possibilities of soul, and decide to actually do something for our spiritual advancement. Let those that have time spend a portion of it in studying the latest forces of the soul. Let those that have money help themselves and others desirous of acquiring such knowledge.

With the performance of the five above named sacrifices, animal man becomes human. The law of the survival of the strongest in the barbaric state of man made him a destructive creature, so that all the time his animal nature prompted him to live on the sacrifice of others. With the turn of moral change in his life, he no longer lives on the weak, but learns to protect them, and even makes sacrifices so that they may be happy and comfortable.

This sublime law of sacrifice has often been misinterpreted and abused. The Brahmins in India and the Jews in Palestine had done it. For centuries together they used to sacrifice animals to the degraded and blood-thirsty intelligences or to an angry God.

An arrogant priesthood, desirous of eating animal food and drinking intoxicating liquors, which they could not do under the established humane custom of protecting animals, is capable of misinterpreting and murdering the sacred Truth, sacrifice the interests of poor, dumb creatures so that their depraved palates may be satisfied. The priesthood always opposes the spread of knowledge and is the foremost advocate of caste. The low class man—the *Shudra*—cannot, in his opinion, even hear the sacred word; his very shadow pollutes the Brahmin. If there are Brahmins in India advocating caste and opposing the spread of education, there are Brahmins in other countries, too, that play the same part in civilization or in retarding civilization. Your modern Christianity that emphasizes the literal interpretation of vicarious atonement would be worse than the Brahmin system of sacrificing animals. Salvation consists in bringing out the immortal and Higher Self of man, which self, being within him, must be unfolded through his own exertions. Our lower nature, our faults and sins have to be worked out by ourselves, and the death of one individual cannot remove the sins of the rest, if it can, where is the necessity of living a righteous life so much emphasized by Jesus? Every man is the maker of his destiny and he must bring about his own salvation.

There was another reason for introducing the system of animal sacrifices. There are powerful

intelligences of a low order living in different regions of the universe and they are fed and nourished with low, vicious emanations going out from men, animals, impure food, etc. Oblations of blood, flesh and spirituous liquors are offered to propitiate those intelligences in practices of black magic. They may for a time help the performers of such sacrifices, but ultimately enslave them.

But the true sacrifice consists in giving up the lower nature, crucifying it on the altar of Higher Self—thus becoming one with “the Father in Heaven.” This ancient truth was mangled and murdered by theologians in the east and the west; let us all join in reviving and restoring that truth to its former purity and thus help mankind in freeing themselves from the bondage of ignorance that is forced upon them.

---

## JAINISM.

---

For this, the last lecture of the course, the subject that I have selected is Jainism, and I shall condense as much as possible the things that might be said on this subject. Any philosophy or religion must be studied from all standpoints, and in order thoroughly to grasp the ideas of any religion or philosophy, know what it says with regard to the

origin of the universe, what its idea is with regard to God, with regard to the soul and its destiny, and what it regards as the laws of the soul's life. The answers to all these questions would collectively give us a true idea of the religion or philosophy. In our country religion is not different from philosophy, and religion and philosophy do not differ from science. We do not say that there is scientific religion or religious science, we say that the two are identical. We do not use the English word religion because it implies a binding back, and conveys the idea of dependence, the dependence of a finite being upon an infinite, and in that dependence consists the happiness or bliss of the individual. With the Jains the idea is a little different. With them bliss consists not in dependence but in independence; the dependence is in the life of the world, and if that life of the world is a part of religion then we may express the idea by the English word, but the life which is the highest life is that in which we are personally independent so far as binding or disturbing influences are concerned. In the highest state the soul, which is the highest entity, is independent. This is the idea of our religion. The first important idea connected with it is the idea of the universe. Is it eternal or non-eternal? Is it permanent or transitory? Of course there are so many different opinions on the subject, but with these opinions I am not concerned in this lecture, I am only going to give the

idea of the Jain philosophy. We say that we cannot study any idea unless we look upon it from all standpoints. We may express this idea by many symbols or forms; we have expressed it by the story of the elephant, and the seven blind men who wanted to know what kind of animal the elephant was, and each touching a different part of the animal, understood its form in so many different ways, and thereupon became dogmatic. If you wish to understand what kind of animal an elephant is, you must look upon it from all sides, and so it is with truth. Therefore we say that the universe from one standpoint is eternal and from another non-eternal. The totality of the universe taken as a whole is eternal. It is a collection of many things. That collection contains the same practices every moment, therefore as a collection it is eternal; but there are so many parts of that collection and so many entities in it, all of which have their different states which occur at different times and each part does not retain the same state at all times. There is change, there is destruction of any particular form, and a new form comes into existence, and therefore if we look upon the universe from this standpoint it is non-eternal. With this philosophy there is no idea, and no place for the idea of creation out of nothing. That idea, really speaking, is not entertained by any right-thinking people. Even those who believe in creation believe from a different standpoint than this. It

cannot come into existence out of nothing, but is an emanation coming out of something. The state only is created. This book in a sense is created because all the particles are put together, having been in a different state. The form of the book is created. There was a beginning of this book and there will be an end. In the same manner, with any form of matter, whether this form lasts for moments or for centuries, if there was a beginning there must be an end. We say that there are both preservation and destruction in the many forces working around us. All these forces are working every moment in the midst of us and around us, and the collection of these entities is called by the Jain's God. The Brahmans represent it by the syllable Omॐ; the first sound in this word represents the idea of creation, the second of preservation and the third of destruction. All these are energies of the universe and taken as a whole they are subject to certain fixed laws. If the laws are fixed why do people bow down to these energies? Why do they consider the collective energy as a god or as God? There is always an idea of the power to do evil in the beginning of this conception. When railroads were first introduced into India ignorant people who did not know what they were who had never seen in their lives that a car or carriage could be moved without the horse or the ox, thought that there was some divinity in the engine, some god or goddess, and some of them would even

bow down before the car, and even to this day you will find in some parts of India, among the pariahs or low class that there are people who entertain this idea. So to these energies in our primitive state we are liable to attribute personality, and after a long course of development we symbolize our thoughts in the form of pictures, and explain them in that way to make them more intelligible to others. In the ancient times there was not rain, but a rainer not thunder but a thunderer, and in that way personality is attributed, or living consciousness and character, to those forces. There may be conscious entities in these forces as there may be living entities on the planets, but these forces themselves are not living entities. This, however, expresses the idea in the beginning, these energies were classed as creative, preservative and destructive, and these three entities were considered to be component parts of one entity called Brahma by the Hindus. Really, creation in this is in the sense of emanation, preservation is used in the sense of preserving the form, and destruction in the sense of destroying the form. The idea of matter is something that can be handled or perceived by the senses, and the energies must be material energies, as cohesion, magnetism, electricity, gravitation, but to consider these God would be the most materialistic idea, and therefore the Jains discard this idea so far as the Godhead or Godlike character is concerned. They of course admit the existence



of these energies, that they are indeed to be found everywhere, but they are subject to fixed laws which cannot be interfered with by any person, not that these energies consciously influence our destinies with regard to good and evil. To say that they do so influence us is only to show our ignorance with regard to their laws. These energies collectively we call substantiality. There are innumerable qualities and attributes in matter itself, and they manifest themselves at different times and ways. We are not able without further development to know what energies are inherent in matter, and when any new thing comes to view we are surprised, and whatever is surprising, is considered to be something coming from divinity, but where we understand scientific principles the surprise is removed and it is all as simple as the daily rising and setting of the sun. Thousands of years ago the different phenomena of nature were considered in different parts of the world to be the working of different gods and goddesses, but when we understand science these phenomena become simple and the idea of these beings as characters of the highest spiritual power goes away. *What is the God of the Jains?* You will ask. I have only told you what he is not. I will now tell you what it is. We know that there is something besides matter; we know that the body exhibits many qualities and powers not to be found in ordinary material substance, and that the

something which causes this departs from the body at death. We do not know where it goes, we know that when it lives in the body, the powers of the body are different from what they are when it is not there. The powers of nature can be assimilated to the body when that something is there. That entity is considered by us the highest, and it is the same inherently in all living beings. This principle common to all of us is called divinity. It is not fully developed in any of us, as it was in the *saviours of the world*, and therefore we call them devine beings. So the collective idea derived from observations of the devine character inherent in all beings is by us called God. While there are so many energies in the material world, and in the spiritual world, and putting those two energies together we give them the name of Nature, we separate the material energies and put them together, but the spiritual energies we put together and call them collectively God. We make a distinction, and worship only the spiritual energies. Why should we do so? A jain verse says "I bow down to that spiritual power or energy which is the cause of leading us to the path of salvation, which is supreme, which is omniscient; I bow down to that power because I wish to become like that power." So where the form of the Jain prayer is given, the object is not to receive anything from that entity or from that spiritual nature, but to become one like that, not that that spiritual entity will make us by

a magic power become like itself, but by following out the ideal which is before our eyes we shall be able to change our own personality, it will be regenerated, as it were, and will be changed into a being which will have the same character as the divinity which is our idea of God. So we worship God, not as a being [who is going to give us something, not because it is going to do something to please us, not because it is profitable in any way, there is not any idea of selfishness, it is like practising virtue for the sake of virtue and without any other motive. *Now we come to the idea of soul.* The ordinary idea of soul substance is that in order for a thing to exist it must have form, must be perceived by the senses. That is our ordinary experience. Really speaking it is the experience only of the sensuous part of the being, the lowest part of the human entity, and from that experience we derive conclusions and think that these conclusions apply to all substance. There are substances which cannot be perceived by the senses; there are subtler sensations and entities and these can be known only by the consciousness, by the soul. Such a substance, which cannot be seen, heard, tasted, smelled or touched, is a substance which need not occupy space, and need not have any tangibility, but it may exist, although it may not have any form (and that substance does not require any space, is intangible and cannot be seen). Sight is

an impression made on the nerves of the eyes by vibrations sent forth from the object perceived and this impression which we call sight, if there are no vibrations coming out of the object, is of course not produced; but if this substance influences us in certain ways, the implication is that there is something moving or producing vibrations, and these can not exist unless there is some material substance which is vibrating. The very fact that something is moving in some way and influences us in some peculiar way implies that there is something material about this. If there are no vibrations, the substance is not material. It need not exist in a form which will give us the impression of any colour, smell etc. There is nothing which can partake both of the attributes of soul and of matter, the attributes of matter are directly contrary to those of the soul. While one has its life in the other it does not become the other. How can that soul live in matter when its attributes are of a different nature? By our own experience we know that we are obliged to live in surroundings which are not congenial to us, which are not of our own nature. that they are not related to their surroundings, there must be some reason for their being obliged to live in those surroundings, but there must be a reason in the intelligence itself; it cannot be in the material substance. We know that this is

a fact, because intelligence cannot proceed from any thing which is purely material. No material substance has given any evidence of having possessed intelligence, it might have done so when there was life in it but without this it has no intelligence. That intelligence is, we are quite sure, influenced by material things, but it does not arise from the material things. Persons of sound intelligence take a large dose of some intoxicating drink and the intelligence will not work at all. Why should this material thing influence the immaterial, the soul? The soul thinks that the body is itself and therefore anything which is done to the material self is supposed by the real self to be done itself. That is where the Christian scientist and the Jain philosophy will agree, that if the soul thinks that the body is its real self, anything done to the body will be considered by the soul to be done to the soul, and therefore what happens to the body will be felt by the soul; but if the soul for a moment thinks that the body is not the self but altogether different and a stranger to the soul, for that reason no feeling of pain will exist; our attention is taken away in some other direction and we do not know what is passing before us. This shows that the self is something higher than the body. Still under ordinary circumstances the soul is influenced by the body and therefore we are to study the laws of the body and soul so as to rise above these little things and proceed on

our path to salvation or liberation, which is the real aspiration of the soul. There is power of matter itself, but that power is lower than the power of the soul. If there was no power at all in the body or in matter, the soul would never be influenced by it, for mere non-existence will never influence anything, but because there is such a thing as matter, when the soul thinks that there is a power of the body and a power of the matter, these powers will influence it. Bodily power as we see it is on account of the presence of the soul. There is a power in matter, as cohesion, etc, and this will work although the soul does not think anything about it. If the moon revolves around the earth there are some forces inherent in the earth and moon. What I mean to say is that the influence of these material powers on the soul powers depends on the soul's readiness or willingness to submit to these powers. If the soul takes the view that it will not be influenced by anything it cannot be so influenced. This being the soul's nature *what is its origin*? Everything can be looked upon from two standpoints, the substance and the manifestation. If the state of the soul itself is to be taken into consideration, that state has its beginning and its end. The state of the soul as living in the human body had a beginning at birth and will have an end at death, but it is a beginning and end of the state, not of the thing itself. The soul taken as a substance is eternal; taken as a state

every state has its beginning and end. So this beginning of a state implies that before this beginning there was another state of the soul. Nothing can exist unless it exists in some state. The state may not be permanent, but the thing must have a state at all times. If therefore the present state of the soul had a beginning, it had another state before the beginning of this state, and after the end of his state it will have another state. So the future state is something that comes out of or is the result of the present state. As the future is to the present so the present is to the past, The present is only the future of the past. What is true with regard to the future state is true with regard to the past and present states. The acts of the past have determined our present state, and if this is true the acts of the present state, must determine the future state. This brings us to the doctrines of rebirth, transmigration of souls, metempsychosis, reincarnation, etc., as they are variously known. First take incarnation, which means literally becoming flesh, and really speaking that which is matter is always matter, and that which is spirit is always spirit or soul. The spirit does not become flesh. If reincarnation means to become flesh there can be no reincarnation, but if it means simply the life in flesh for a short time, then there is reincarnation. Reincarnation means also to be born in some state again and again. Metempsychosis means in the Greek

only change; that the animal itself, body and soul, everything together, is changed into the human being and the human being, body and soul, is changed into some other being, and that is altogether changed into some other thing and so on. That is the idea of metempsychosis. Transmigration of souls is, especially in the idea of the Christians, the idea of the human soul going into the animal body, as if this were a necessity. But that is not the real idea; the real idea is simply going from one place to another or, from one body to another, but not necessarily going from the human body to the animal body, but simply travelling. It implies the idea of form. Nothing can travel unless it has form and occupies space and is material, so in our philosophy we reject all these terms if that is the idea connected with these terms, and use the idea of rebirth; that is, the soul is born in some other body, and birth does not imply the same conditions applying to the human birth. There are certain conditions in which human beings are born; the seed itself takes several months to ripen and then there is the birth. This may be due to certain acts or forces which are generated by human beings. These are in a condition to be observed by beings whose forces will take them to some other planet, and we say that there is another condition of birth there. There is no necessity for gestation and fecundation. The Karmic body has



in itself many powers, and has a force to take to itself another body, which is in the case of the human being a gross body, but in the case of other beings a subtle body is generated, and this body is changeable so far as its form and dimensions are concerned, therefore if the forces generated while we live any kind of life are of different kinds then in the case of some being it may be necessary that he should be born in the human condition, and pass through the actual conditions which must be obeyed if the human being is to be born, while if the forces generated are different in their character he may be born on some other planet where birth is manifested in a different way, without any necessity of the combination of the male and the female principle. There are so many different planes of life that the mere study of the human life ought not to be made to apply to all the affairs of life. We have studied only a few forms of the life of animals, human beings, etc., but that is only the part which under the present development of our science, of our eyesight even, we are able to study. We are not able to study other forms of life, innumerable in the universe, and therefore we ought not to apply the laws thus discovered to all forms of life. Our study is introspective because our idea is that the soul is able to know everything under the right circumstances. The knowledge acquired in these conditions is of a sounder nature and of a more correct kind

because the obstacles which come in the way of science are not there. Science has to commit mistakes and think they do not; still knowledge is derived from inferences which we draw from certain premises which may not be right or if the premises are right the inferences may be wrong. We do not mean to say that there are always mistakes in the knowledge which is acquired through sensation or through matter, but sometimes it is possible, and while it may be correct knowledge in many cases we cannot rely on that. The highest knowledge is immediate knowledge, derived by the soul without the assistance of any external thing, and the knowledge of liberated souls, and also the knowledge of human beings who are just on the point of being liberated, or have passed through the course of discipline, mental, moral and spiritual and have nearly exhausted past forces, at the same time, generating spiritual forces, and on account of discipline and spiritual evolution have become receptive. The soul sees everything when this state is arrived at, it knows everything, is fully conscious and consciousness itself means first of all that it knows itself, and to know one's self means that it is something, some reality, and there can be no reality unless it can distinguish itself from other realities. Only one universal thing could not know itself, because knowledge implies comparing one with another, and if that is not done there is no individuality. We

say therefore that the soul in its highest existance knows that it is perfectly separte from other things so far as experince and knowledge are concerned, but in so far as its nature is concerned, so long as there is a sense of seperateness there is no occasion, or opportunity for the soul to rise higher because when the soul thinks that it is living a different existence for its own sake it is considering its own selfish to be different from another person, and thinks that this is its own and a part of its nature, its own being, and therefore anything done in regard to these surroundings will benefit or injure its own nature. It even thinks that its very life consists in doing good and in loving other souls and taking active measures for carrying into effect the very plan of that soul Then it comes higher, and ultimately reaches the highest condltion The condition of the soul, as I have said, is the higest in which there is perfect consciousness there is infinite knowledge and infinite bliss; we express these three ideas in Sanskrit as existence infinite, bliss infinite and knowledge infinite. That condition of the soul cannot be described by us because description is something which proceeds from a finite mind and when the soul becomes infinite no finite mind can fully express the condition of that infinite state. The attributes we give therefore to that condition of the soul are always full of comprehensive. We shall always leave out many things; we have not the power

to express all our thoughts. How can we express, then, this state of a soul which so far as its power and knowledge are concerned is infinite ? The Jains, have studied the nature of the soul and the universe from these standpoints and have derived a beautiful principle, and so far as this is concerned there is this difference between this country and other countries and other religions, they can understand all these from these standpoints The Bible says 'Thou shalt not kill,' and the Jains practise universal love so that this also means that we should not kill any beings If we say that the Bible does not mean that we take away a part of the Bible why should we interpret the laws of any religion from the narrowest standpoint ? We should take into consideration the nature, attributes and working of all things We cannot derive laws which are to be applied to the whole universe simply by our observation of a part of the conscious nature of the universe. If you wish to state correctly the nature of the universe you will study the nature of all the different parts of the universe and then the laws will be applicable to all parts of it We think that we are superior to other things because our tenants who live on the ground floor are inferior to us, but we have no right therefore to crush those tenants, who later on will acquire the right to inhabit the second and third floors and finally the highest floor One living on the highest plane has no right to crush those who live

on the lowest plane If one thinks that he has a right to do this, that he has not sufficient strength to live without destroying life, our philosophy says that it is still a sin to destroy life, and it remains only to choose the lowest form, the less evil. We will in business take such a kind of business as will yield the most profit and will cause us to lose the least, in which we have the less liabilities; and the highest condition will be that in which we have no liabilities and no creditors, the state in which we may live without any creditors or in a perfectly free condition That is the liberated condition The idea of *Karma* is very complicated. I have told you something of it in my former lectures. The one chief point is that that theory is not the theory of fatalism not a theory in which the human being is tied down to some one, bound down by the force of something outside himself In one sense only will there be fatalism, if we are free to do many things, we are also not free to do other things, and we cannot be freed from the results of our acts. Some results may be manifested in great strength; others very weakly some may take a very long time and others a very short time; some are of such a nature that they take a long time to work out, while the influence of others may be removed by simply washing with water and that will be the case in the matter of acts done incidentally without any settled purpose or any fixed desire In such a case with reference

to many acts we may counteract their effects by willing to do so. So the theory of *Karma* is not in any sense a theory of fatalism, but we say that all of us are not going to one goal without any desire on our part, not that we are to reach that state without any effort on our part, but that our present condition is the effect of our acts, thoughts and words in the past state. To say that all will reach the perfect state merely because some one has died that they might be saved, merely from a belief in this person, would be a theory of fatalism, because those who have lived a pure and virtuous state and have not accepted a certain theory will not reach that state while those who accept it will reach the perfected state simply for that reason and no other. The faith in saviours is simply this, that by following out the divine principle which is in our own selves when this is fully developed we also shall become Christs, by the crucifixion of the lower nature on the altar of the higher. We also use the cross as a symbol. All living beings have to pass through or evolve from the lowest, the monadic condition, to the highest state of existence, and cannot reach this unless they obtain possession of the three things necessary *right belief*, *right knowledge* and *right conduct*. The *right belief* is really speaking, is not that there is no passing through forms after death, but the soul keeps progressing always in its own nature without any backward direction at all. We

have expressed this in clear language without any parables or metaphors, but when we preach these truths to the ignorant masses, some story or picture might be necessary for them, and after that the explanation of the real meaning, as we have an allegory in the Pilgrim's Progress. It is just like reaching the Celestial City in that book, but we must all understand that these things are parables. Others may need music to assist their religion, but when we understand the esoteric meaning which underlies all religions there will be no quarrelling and no need of names or of forms, and this is really the object of all religions.

---

## Have christian missions to India been successful?

---

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and gentlemen,

You have heard the scholarly views of our friend and brother. ( Bishop Thoburn. ) The views as they have been presented to you must appear convincing to those who have not seen or fully understood the other side: and I am most grateful to the Nineteenth Century Club that they have honored my country by giving me the opportunity to express my views on the subject of Christian Missions in India, which may not be very

important to the Christians of America, as they are rich and may well afford to misspend their money, but which is of great importance to my country as it has the tendency of affecting India vitally. But to you, the members of the Nineteenth Century Club, the subject seems to have presented an unusual importance, from the fact that this nation spends thousands of dollars for a work, the necessity of which is doubted by many even in this country. Christian Missions to India implies that India is a land of heathens and, therefore, stands on the same level with the Andaman or the Fiji Islands. That a country which has been recognised in all ages the world over as being the Mother of all religions and the cradle of civilization should be considered by Christians as heathens shows how much ignorance prevails in Christendom. I grant that such wrong impressions about India are caused solely by the missionaries who are noted, If not for anything else, at least for ignorance and lack of discrimination.

In the first place, the men sent out to India on missionary duty are, as a European who has mixed with them says, "usually utterly ignorant of the history of India except perhaps its most recent phases and what is still more, they know nothing of (even if capable of understanding) the Hindu religion and philosophy. The result is, that with a narrow



dogmatic creed and an inability to see any good outside of it, they render themselves offensive and contemptible in the eyes of educated natives." Since coming to this country, I have been studying your educational, industrial and religious institutions and have endeavored to know how the missionaries and clergymen are made. here ; and when I take into consideration the ways in which they are manufactured, I sometimes think the Missionaries ought not to be censured so severely on account of the odious doctrines they propagate. I concede that some of them are frequently large-hearted and pious. but as a rule, they are narrow-minded and ignorant and are so devoid of spirituality that they are unable to recognise spiritual ideas or truths under other names or forms than those they have learned in their schools and colleges I admit that the missionaries are generally affectionate husbands and good parents of frequently large families, and had they remained at home uncontaminated by the elastic business-morality, they would <sup>have</sup> turned out <sup>good</sup> tradesman or faithful clerks, but we know that in this age of competition and under a system of centralization of wealth and creation of monopolies, many persons are forced from their natural spheres into the Church, open to them, and when there is a keen competition in the clerical ranks, an outlet must be found for the surplus; it becomes therefore, requisite to create a market for

them in foreign countries What have Christian Mission accomplished in India in religion ? They have spread a false theology, theology not only false but positively injurious to the best interests of mankind Why does the idea of life of a Hindu differ from that of a Christian ? Simply because the theory of one is different from that of the other Hinduism, Jainism and Buddhism have a certain theory of the Universe, of the origin of evil, of the suffering of living beings, as to their origin and so on, and each of these religions is nothing but a ramification of the principles underlying those theories The same is the case with the Christians' religion. Whatever may be the difference in detail between the respective theories and theologies of the religions of India and Christianity, there is this characteristic which marks Christianity out from other religions It says that the whole world is destined for Christ, that Christianity is the only true religion and that the world is to be saved only by the Gospel message of the Bible. With such fanatical views these Missionaries go to India and introduce among the people, doctrines which have long since been exploded by the light of science and reason. And still, in preaching those doctrines in India, the Missionaries claim that they proclaim the truth. Of course "truth" is used by them in a technical sense meaning " their own beliefs " In fact, Christianity and Truth are, in their opinion, con-

vertible terms. In a similar way they interpret the word "superstition" which, in their vocabulary, means the religious belief of all non-Christians. They say that the 19th Century Christianity is the only true religion. With them, Christianity has assumed different garbs. There was the Christianity of Christ, with certain ideas of God, his working, &c. Then came a different kind of Christianity, that of the fathers of the Church who are now regarded by many Christians as ignorant. Then came the Christianity of the Middle ages which at present is looked upon as a mass of superstition. Then came Protestantism with its new features. So Christianity is not a religion whose principles or doctrines are fixed, but is a growth; as it develops, it becomes in the eyes of its votaries more perfect and true. And how does it develop and grow? Sometimes by the addition of new dogmas, sometimes by factions, i. e. the addition of sects and denominations. If the new dogmas are accepted by the people who never take the trouble of thinking for themselves they become a part of Christianity. Thus, current opinion becomes truth to them. It becomes "truth" as soon as it is accepted, the same thing becomes falsehood as soon as it is rejected, the truth of yesterday is not the truth of to-day and the truth of to-day will not be the truth of to-morrow. And still all these added and rejected dogmas pass in the name of Christ who knew nothing

about them and are propagated under his name and as if by his command, and the result has been disastrous

We all fully understand that the debasement of a nation's coinage is most disastrous to its commerce and revenues. It is an acknowledged fact to day, the world over, that the spiritual coinage has become debased. It is also a fact that all religions worthy of the name are making great efforts to purify and return to their original standard—I should have said all religions except Christianity. The intellectual Hindus do not deny that their religion, as understood by the masses to-day, is not in its pure and unadulterated state as formerly, and the all-important question with them is—what are the real ideas expressed in their sacred literature? Christians surely must know, even with greater certainty, that the 19th Century Christianity is not the religion taught by Jesus. Christians well know that their religion has become changed and corrupted as comparative theology and philological and other criticisms of their sacred books are more advanced than in the case of other religions. But Christians theologians are well aware that were they to attempt to purify their religion of to-day and bring it back to the standard of Apostolic days, the result would be to reform it out of existence. The Christian churches know this to be a fact. During

the past century and especially during the past quarter century, the origin of Christainity has been fully exposed, its rise has been traced in detail, its early struggles noted, its gradual changes recorded, its growth, its dogmas and doctrines have been patiently studied and minutely decribed. Its family likeness to other religions has been noted and its relationship discovered It is easy to see how much Christianity has adopted from other and older religions or this and that older cosmogony, whence it copied its organization and from whence it collected the miscellaneous literature to form its Bible, whence it took its festivals, its liturgies and rituals and even its architecture its vestments and sacred paraphernalia

Christianity stands to day before the world completely "explained" Every Christian knows that he can procure from any well-known book-seller volumes that will disprove completely and scientifically the devine origin of Christianity, and every step in its progress is laid bare and shown to be indisputably due to purely natural causes. And Christians also know that these books have not been written by scoffers but generally by men of profound learning, of intense earnestness and deep piety and frequently of great ability, many of whom have devoted a lifetime to untiring study and research of these subjects. Christians also know that there is not an article in their creed which has not been analysed

by reason and logic, and tested by the canons of morality and justice and they know that the result of this examination, made by men as religious and quite as intelligent as themselves, is the utter condemnation of the central ideas of their religion—an angry God and vicarious atonement—which are contrary to every fact in nature, as to the better aspirations of the human heart, and, in our present stage of enlightenment, are absurd, preposterous and blasphemous propositions

Christians well know that their much decorated sculptured statuary is not of pure chiselled marble, but that it is of clay, cemented together by blood and tears and hardened in the fires of hatred and persecution. And still the cry of the host of Christendom is "The whole world for Christ "

What has the contact of Christian nations with Hindus done for the latter? The idea generally prevalent in this country about the morality and truthfulness of the Hindus evidently has been very low they are all classed as Heathens and Pagans by the so-called religious representatives of the western world who fail by their conduct to call forth respect from the Hindu. Their unjust and diabolical charges against the Hindus have done, are doing, and will continue to do, more mischief in inter-racial matters than even the bitterest enemy of your republic could have invented. Such seeds of enmity

and hatred have been sown by the Missionaries that I would have considered it to be an almost Herculean task to establish better relations between India and America, had it not been for the Parliament of Religions and the spread of liberal thought from its platform.

It has become an article of faith with most of the orthodox Christians that the Hindus are liars. All sorts of abuses are heaped on the people of India from the Himalaya to Ceylon, and, without exception all these calumnies proceed either from the Missionaries or the English officer. We accord them as we do even the tiniest animalcule the right to live and be happy in their own way, if they let us alone, but when we find that these little creatures are annoying us, we have to brush them aside. The statements of these Missionaries made about the Hindus, their religions and life, are an admirable illustration of their methods and zeal. When I first came to know in this country from Missionary sources that in India women threw their babies into the Ganges and that people threw themselves under the car of Juganauth, I doubted whether in the blackest and most intolerant days of the Christian Church any set of villainous priests ever invented more bare-faced falsehoods or malicious slanders. It was a Missionary of the Christian Church who threw a fire-brand in the peaceful assembly of the Parliament of Religions and attracted the representatives

from India in the very house of their and his hosts. It is such persons who give you glowing reports of Christian Missions in India. They claim that they have raised the moral standard of the people, the position of the women, the religious ideas of the masses and what not. I shall now examine their claims.

What was the moral status of the Hindus before the outer-barbarians invaded India? If we examine the Greek, Chinese, Persian or Arab writings before the time of the Mahomedan invasion we will find in them the description of the true national character of the Hindus, i. e., the regard for truth and justice. Arrian in the 2nd century, Hiouen thsang the famous Buddhist pilgrim in the 7th century and Marco Polo in the 13th century have each written in his best terms of praise of the Hindu Character, of their truthfulness, honesty and the straight forwardness of their administration and justice. What Government either in Europe or America can justly lay claim to this virtue? the Mahomedan Geographer, Idrisi, says "The Indians are naturally inclined to justice and never depart from it in their actions. Their good faith, honesty and fidelity to their engagements are well-known and they are so famous for these qualities that people flock to their country from every side." In the face of the statement—what has Christian civilization done for India. I might quote to you passage after passage."



admiration of Hinu virtues which impressed the foreigners who came into contact with them before Christian civilization reached us, but time will not permit me to do so. My main purpose is to show to you that the presence and predominating influence of foreigners, Scytheons, Mongolians, Mahomedans or Christians has been to deteriorate India. The literature and philosophy of Ancient India have excited the admiration of all scholars except Christian Missionaries.

If I were asked under what sky the human mind has most fully developed some of its choicest gifts, has most deeply pondered on the greatest problems of life, and has found solutions of some of them which well deserve the attention of those who have studied Plato and Kant—I should point to India. And if I were to ask myself from what literature we hear in Europe, we who have been nurtured almost exclusively on the thoughts of Greeks and Romans and of one Semitic race, the Jewish, may draw that corrective which is most wanted in order to make our inner life more perfect, more comprehensive, more universal, in fact more truly human, a life, not for this life alone, but a transfigured and eternal life—again I should point to India. ” “Before India became the hunting-ground of foreign marauders, she had produced poets and philosophers at whose feet Homer or Plato, Shakespear or Bacon

would have done well to sit and learn. But when these barbarians overran *Aryavarta* and made it into Hindoostan; when Mahomed of Ghuzni the great iconoclast made it his business to trample everything that was dear and sacred to the Aryan mind, when Zenghiskhan and his successors with the exception of one or two spread their tyranny over the country and lastly when the European Commerce and Western Civilization began to suck the very blood of India, would you wonder that India is not in the same condition as it was in days gone by.

The wonder is that not with standing these foreign attacks, India and her people have survived, that not with standing the demoralizing influences of foreigners, India still leads in spirituality and morality Sir T Munro says —“If a good system of agriculture, unrivalled, manufacturing skill, a capacity to produce whatever can contribute to either convenience or luxury, schools established in every village for teaching reading writing, and arithmetic, the general practice of hospitality and charity amongst each other, and above all, a treatment of the female sex full of confidence, respect, and delicacy, are among the signs which denote a civilized people—then the Hindus are not inferior to the nations of Europe, and if civilisation is to become an article of trade between England and India, I am convinced that England will gain by the import cargo ” Professor Wilson, professor of Sanskrit at

Oxford for many years says, "I have lived both from necessity and choice very much among the Hindus and had opportunities of becoming acquainted with them in a greater variety of situations than those in which they usually come under the observation of Europeans. In the Calcutta Mint for instance, I was in daily personal communication with a numerous body of artificers, mechanics and labourers and always found amongst them cheerful and unwearied industry, good humored compliance with the will of their superiors and a readiness to make whatever exertions were demanded from them. There was amongst them, no drunkenness no disorderly conduct, no insubordination." This was before the rivalry for the premium on large reports of the success of Christian Missions in India. What is the state of the low class people now in India under the benign influence of Christian Missions? The vice of drunkenness has become common to them. The Christian Government of India has systemized the vice of drinking and turned it into profit whereas no native ruler had ever raised revenues by liquor. Under the reign of the King of Oudh, there was not one liquor shop in Lucknow; now, under the rule of Christian Government, there are more than a hundred. The same was the case in Upper Burmah under the reign of Theebau. Now a large revenue is gathered from the liquor traffic. In one year only ( 1890-91 )

the English Government derived Rupees 4,947,780 from the liquor traffic—a revenue three . or four times larger than that derived either from Customs or Assessed Taxes, or Forest or Registration or Post Office and seven times as large as from Telegraphs, eight times as large as from Law and Justice. The income is increasing every year by \$ 500,000. Fifteen years ago it was calculated that not above 10 per cent of the people of india drank spirits, now they are paid to be over 20 per cent To our rulers, then who are our political Christian Missionaries, the money howsoever obtained is the highest Gospel and certainly Christianity is responsible for all this because the first representatives of Christianity sanctioned the use of wine under the pretext of a religious ceremony Why, this is, in fact, an inseparable incident of Christianity as it is viewed by the low class people who are perverted to Christianity This is one of the vices which Christian civilization is forcing on us, and you will be startled when I tell you that even the missionaries have administered intoxicants in many instances to the world—be converts that the conversion might become more easy and sure and thereby a larger report sent out. It is a fact that perversion precedes conversion or enlistment and registration I make this statement not upon my own authority but upon the authority of your own countrymen of high commercial standing

who have mixed for years with missionaries in India and have been eye witnesses to such diabolical methods. Even in this country I have been told by those who claim to have been present when the same methods were used with the Red Indians.

With such practices, these men talk of the fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man, the universal love and liberality of thought. Even aside from these acts the teachings propagated among the most ignorant of the low classes is at best a dogma of one or other particular sect, first and foremost of which is that the Holy Scriptures of the old and new Testament is the only word of God, the only rule of faith and obedience. Now if the Scriptures are what has been claimed for them, i. e. if they are the infallible word of God from beginning to end, then we must discard all other sources of knowledge and follow only the teachings of this one book. But have even the most pious Christians, with any intelligence at all, really followed this doctrine to the exclusion of all other sources of knowledge? Certainly we know as a fact that they have not. This one fact shows that in this respect, Christianity has been a failure as the sole source of light and life, not only in India but in any other country. What sane literary man would consider the Bible to be the inspired word of God, especially when he raises the question as to who wrote the books, when they were written, and where they were written.

I do not intend to enter into a discussion of the fallibility or infallibility of the Bible, but it is a fact that the first bright spark of knowledge presented to the poor benighted souls of the Hindus is this theory about the Bible. Next, the Missionary teaches that the world and all things therein were created by the word of God's power out of nothing within the space of six days, and all very good. How many of your intelligent people believe in this dogma. If, as I am told, few people believe in it and many are trying to explain it away, yet the Bible teaching in this is none the less a failure. And the relation between God and man is explained thus.—I here quote from the Presbyterian confession of Faith.

“ The distance between God and the creature is so great, that although reasonable creatures do owe obedience unto him as their creator, yet they could never have any fruition of him, as their blessedness and reward but by some voluntary condescension on God's part, which he hath been pleased to express by way of covenant ”

“ The first covenant made with man was a covenant of works wherein life was promised to Adam, and in him to his posterity, upon condition of perfect and personal obedience ”

“ Man, by his fall, having made himself incapable of life by that covenant the Lord was pleased

to make a second, commonly called the covenant of grace requiring of them faith in him, that they may be saved, and promising to give unto all those that are ordained unto life, his holy spirit, to make them willing and able to believe "

Also I find this teaching viz., "that the sinfulness of that estate whereinto man fell, consisteth in the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of that righteousness wherein he was created, and the corruption of his nature, whereby he is utterly indisposed, disabled and made opposite unto all that is spiritually good, and wholly inclined to all evil, and that continually, which is commonly called original sin, and from which do proceed by the fall of man through one man Adam, all men have been cursed of God and are the bond-slaves of satan

This is the kind of teaching which the American people are spending thousands of dollars to propagate. We, the heathens of India, fail to see the Christian God in the light of a God of love and mercy I have no time in which to speak of the pernicious effects of the doctrine of vicarious atonement and eternal hell. But this is the Christianity offered to the poor illiterate of India. A mere outside husk of the most exoteric form and that not even the teaching of Jesus. The cruel and blooy Jewish Jehovah is only masked, not altered at all by the illbefitting

robe of "*loving mercy*" in which theologians have enveloped him. I do not see how the dogmas and doctrines presented by the Christian ministers or missionaries can ever elevate the spiritual state of any nation. The doctrine concerning the Godhead the destiny of soul and the purpose of existence as taught by the Christian clergy are so incompatible with ancient philosophy or modern science that instead of furthering the development of humanity, they would and have arrested its growth in this world and the next.

I beg you to bear in mind that I do not mean in any sense to say that the religions as now practised in India are not in any necessity of purification. I acknowledge that the Hindu religion will bear regeneration but that must come from the earnest and united efforts of the Hindus themselves. There are visible signs in India for the revival of the ancient philosophy but to expect dogmatic Christianity to take root among the Hindus has seemed not only to the Hindus but to the thinking and intelligent foreigners to be absurd. The earnest efforts therefore of the missionaries to christianise India have not only not succeeded, but have proved in many respects harmful. Putting aside the theological view of Christianity—it has spread intolerance—intolerance being the root-principle of Christianity. Toleration of other religions is impossible for Christianity for



the simple reason that one of its fundamental doctrines is that there is no salvation outside of its pale. 'They who have never heard the Gospel, know not the Jesus Christ, and believe not in him, cannot be saved, be they ever so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature, or the laws of that religion which they profess; neither is there salvation in any other, but in Christ alone, who is the saviour only of his body the church.' It is then clearly impossible that other religions should find any way to live with Christianity since the latter is pledged by its very constitution to undermine and destroy all others

Christianity cannot now destroy other religions by fire and sword as it has done in the past when the church and the bloody sword were inseparable powers, but if the end is death, 'it is a mere matter of detail' as a writer has said, "whether one gets his head cut off or is nailed up in a barrel of honey "

Next to intolerance, Christianity has introduced many vices in India which were unknown to the Hindus. You may say that these vices are not Christian, that Christianity has nothing to do with them. This may be true in a measure, but Christianity does not come alone; it does not come direct through Jesus Christ. It comes to us through its modern representatives. It comes percolating

through the layers of superstition and bigotry, of intolerance and persecution, of damnation and eternal hell-fire. It takes on itself the qualities of these layers and imparts them to those that are received within its folds, in addition to the vices that are its own—such as proceed from the doctrine of vicarious atonement and original sin. And further it has brought to us its peculiar ideas of life, of marriage, of social relations and what not.

The ideas of life with which we were infused long before my country became the coveted land of invaders and which are still the underlying principles of our so-called superstitions were and are different from those of Christian nations. The idea of life with you, has always been, as one of your ablest scholars has put it, as that of a struggle for existence, a struggle for power and dominion, for wealth and enjoyment. These are the ideas which dominate the history of all nations whose history is known to you and naturally these would be their ideas as long as they overlook the eternity of duration, the infinity of space, and the omnipotence of soul and consequently they look upon this life "as an arena for gladiatorial strife and combat or as a market for cheating and huckstering."

We in India, from the lowest Pariah to the highest potentate look upon life here as a mere

waiting room from the known to the unknown, as a mere stage of growth from the lowest animalcule to the highest and perfected state We believe in the eternity of the soul meaning thereby that it is eternal at both ends—at the beginning as well as at the end ; we preach and practice brotherhood not only of men but of all living beings—not on Sundays only but all the days of the week We believe in the law of universal justice that our present condition is the result of our past actions and that we are not bound down by the freak of an irresponsible governor—Judge and Prosecutor at the same time ; we depend for our salvation on our own acts and deeds and not on a constituted attorney Our rites and ceremonies may appear to you as mere superstitions but modern science is just now beginning to understand that they are all based on scientific principles The reason why a monk of my community would not touch money is based on the laws of polarity ; the reason why a layman sits in a peculiar posture before a monk or a teacher is based on the physiological laws of the negative and positive conditions of the body. The reason why a religious teacher when delivering a discourse points his fingers in this way is based on the laws of human magnetism The reason why a Hindu before taking his meal washes his hands and feet is based on the laws of electricity Instead of propagating the knowledge of philosophical and scientific reasons of our so called superstitious acts which are daily per-

formed in India, do you wish to convert the three hundred millions of the people of my country to a faith which depends for its very existence on vicarious atonement and fall of main principles which are against, not only Hindu reason but human reason. But my missionary friends say they are educating the people of India I ask them—with what object It is only a bait offered for the purpose of catching the Hindu fish into the Christian net The mission schools are Christian schools established with the avowed object of perverting the Hindus to Christianity. The education is given there from a Christian or rather a theological standpoint Educate a child in the Christian religion and the child will profess that religion That is no sign of christian success The secular education given either in these schools or Government English schools has, instead of developing our youths, suppressed their intellectual progress and wrested them violently into unnatural directions

This is the result of the Christian educational policy And how is that educational system supported ? It is supported out of the revenues derived from taxation. The taxes levied on Hindus also go to support the missionary institutions to which government gives grants-in-aid When the East India Company got possession of India, they posed as friends of the Hindus against the Mahomedan oppressors and they remained the friends of the

Hindu's religion until these missionaries landed in India. From that time instead of the government supporting the Hindu's religion the Hindu is forced to support the Christian's religion out of his own pocket and to look at his own expense at the solemn farce which is carried on in the mission schools. Bishop Thoburn in his work on India honestly admits that stratagems had to be used in getting children into the secular and Sunday schools; he mentions how successful the missionaries were in establishing a dozen or so Sunday schools in Lucknow in 1877, but he omits to mention that before that time there was not one drinking saloon in that city, but now there are more than a hundred.

My brothers and sisters of America, there is not a shadow of hope of christianizing India. You send the missionary to my country to make converts but every convert he makes he transmits an industrious tiller of soil into an idle worthless loafer and frequently a drunkard and he becomes a charge on the contributions which are yearly sent by English and American societies to convert the heathens to christianity After two hundred years of spending millions of dollars, with the prestige of a conquering religion and with the British bayonet to back, with a conquered nation forced to support it even when they are starving themselves Christianity in India is not supported by the converts

themselves. Every bit of Protestant Christianity in India is maintained by the money flowing from England or America. If you mean that three hundred millions of our people are going to be converted, that is to say, to be bought off by American or English money, I gladly wish for that day only I would beg of American men and women to send agents in different parts in India so that they may advertize and buy poor needy Hindus at a thousand dollars per head, so that the Americans would have more Christians and the Hindus would have more money and there would be an end to the present horrible system under which the greater part of the money you send to buy the people is swallowed by the machinery. In one word, send more money and less men

I do not think that the missionary has a realisation of the enormity of his stupendous undertaking when he attempts to christianise the teeming multitudes of India. There are many factors which stand in his way. The people of India as a whole are saturated in religious and spiritual thought; they think and contemplate on spiritual matters from childhood to death; even the average street-sweeper is frequently more profoundly versed in the subtle metaphysics and divine philosophy than the missionary sent to convert him. The Aryan Hindu will not change his religion simply because some one tells him to do. He has an active brain and an

intellect that will not blindly bend at the will of any man; there must be reason, there must be philosophy; mere assertion is valueless.

Besides thus, there are popular reasons why Christianity has made itself disagreeable to Hindus. Christians being meat-eaters and wide-imbibers seem to the Hindus to represent a religion devoid of humanitarian or spiritual principles. You do not know what disgust and horror the meat-eating produces in the eyes of the simple-minded Hindu. The very practice of using wine at your Lord's Supper sanctions the use of wine at any other time. The Hindu cannot and does not want to accept such a religion. This is the reason why certain sects in India excommunicate their members who go to foreign countries and use there meat and wine. That the representatives of a nation who fatten and kill hundreds and thousands of hogs and steers every day for self-gratification should go to a mild and humane people and preach humanity to them without ever practising it is beyond the comprehension of the Hindu mind.

Sitting at a distance of ten thousand miles, Ladies and gentlemen, you cannot have any ideas of the conduct and acts of the missionaries in India. Englishmen as conquerors of India claim extra-territorial right throughout the whole of India. They make a small colony in each city and live there. The

missionary goes and lives in that little colony and keeps himself steady. He is bound to fawn and flatter these Anglo-Indian officials and condone, and directly or indirectly sanction all the horrible brutalities which the Anglo-Indians perpetrate. Like other missionaries Bishop Thoburn has devoted one chapter in his work on India in toadying to the English officers and their conduct.

Ladies and Gentlemen, you have heard all your lives from your missionaries who claim to be the messengers of God how ugly, wretched, immoral, and vile the heathens of India are; you have heard it over and over till it has become the national idea of your people. Your children are taught these ideas as they take in the mother's milk, but did you ever hear from these missionaries—the messengers of love to all mankind, of the tyrannies that are perpetrated over the Hindus in India; government have abolished duties on fine dry goods from Liverpool and Manchester for the purpose of finding a good market in India and have levied a 200 per cent tax on the manufacture of salt in India to maintain a costly government. Did they ever tell you about all such things? If they have not, whose messengers would you call these people who always side with tyranny, who throw their cloak of hypocritical religion over murderers and all sorts of criminals who happen to belong to their religion.



or to their country? You may think these men to be messengers of God; they may cheat with their smooth tongued words the men and women of America into subscribing largely to misson funds and thus bribe their passage to heaven. But India knows them.

The many learned missionary gentlemen who have written or who have exhausted their oratorical powers in denouncing India can only prove their claim to be an authority when they show their knowledge of the Hindu religion, and this can only be proven by their knowledge of Sanskrit. No man can know a bit of Hindu religion until he knows perfectly the Sanskrit language. When they can converse with me in this language, I shall consider their words worthy of consideration and not before. And if they cannot do this I would ask—what have they been doing so many years in India.

These missionaries pose as friends of the poor; but did they ever tell you that the average income of a Hindu is about fifty cents per month? One half of the population of India have only one meal per day and with all this the pressure of taxation is increasing every day till the nation is almost driven to the verge of despair.

Millons live habitually upon wild flowers. The year in which Queen Victoria was proclaimed the Empress of India and whilst the government was

spending thousands and thousands of dollars to proclaim to, a downtrodden and suppliant race the power of the Christian government, five millions and a half of men, women and children died of actual starvation. Did the missionaries ever raise a voice for this? No There never has been a commission to inquire into these horrible things to find out a remedy. But these missionaries and their co-adjutors started a commission to inquire into the evil of opium-eating in India, as if men who had not money enough to buy bread would indulge in the luxurise of opium eating Indeed there is no height of absurdity which hypocrisy does not dare to climb The whole secret of that opium-commission and all such non-descript agitations is that these missionaries want more money and by some such method they begin the agitation and the money flows in ; honor comes to the wealthy donors but their dollars all roll into the missionary pockets.

Citizens of New York, your agitations against a corrupted city government, your determined attempt to destroy all bossism has elicited the praise of the whole world; but do you know that an organization ten thousand times more powerful than Tammany could ever be, a hundred thousand times more vile and baneful in its influence than Tammany, can ever hope to be is that clique known in America as the foreign mission board. The Tammany-tiger aims at

the pocket of men, but this terrible monster is sucking the blood of your people to spend it in good living in foreign countries and all this is done in the name of religion. The claws of Tammany reach only to a very few, but this tremendous wheel of cheating black-mailing and damning reaches the rich and the poor alike; it crushes under its weight old and young alike; it has no mercy for the poor or the miserable, the schoolboy or the servant-girl, the millionaire or the workman. Cheat one and all alike, this is its motto. These saints talk of the caste in India, here is a caste of missionaries springing right amongst you; I have found there are hereditary missionaries for three or four generations and missionary bosses who control the appointment, the pay and the promotion for which the hungry hundreds of missionaries wait at their door. These holy men talk of the Hindu superstitions. They had better examine their own religion. A religion whose beginning is in blood, whose salvation is in blood, whose purity is in innocent blood, whose hope of saintship is in a dream of a sea of blood, whose revivals are brought about by a preaching and a vision of the sea of blood afresh, would do better by talking less of the superstitions of other nations.

My Christian brothers and sisters of America, your missionaries often glory in having taken upon themselves the task of educating the poor outcasts of India. In a lecture which I have had the honor

to deliver before thousands of people of this country I said —“ What I have learned of your great system of the education of the masses which I admit cannot be very great or particular for the reason that my observations have been necessarily limited, is to me an encouragement beyond words to express if my impressions are just and true ”

Since delivering that lecture I have observed much controversy among the people of this country in relation to the character—I may say—the religious character of the common school. A large class of citizens, believers in certain form of religion oppose and even go so far as to denounce the school system, because of its “ Godless character ”, while the majority sustain this great system of education, because of its secular or neutral character as to religion, and this fact, namely the secular character of the common school system is in the estimation of the wisest people of all religions its chief glory. If you should undertake to teach in your common schools the distinctive dogmatic doctrines of Christianity, would not you put in jeopardy the system itself by inaugurating a revolution ? But now, in my country your missionaries insist upon doing that for us as necessary to our civilization and education which you do not dare advocate or defend at home. I must repeat that we Hindus hail with unfeigned satisfaction any movement looking toward the real advancement and education of the masses but we

cannot but protest with all our soul against using the privilege and necessity of education as a means of propagating religious tenets, repulsive to our conscience and to our sense of moral obligations and relationships. I beg that I be not misunderstood. I would plead for tolerance, before you, for my brethren and their religion and in the same breath beg of you secular education and the means of that education. When you suppress and limit your common school curriculum by imposing upon it the catechism, with the approval of the populations of your great country, it would be time enough to make it the shibollet of your onslaught upon the "benighted Hindus under the white banner of education."

Because I dispute the correctness of the Christian missionary method and deny its value, I must not be understood to dispute the right or to deny the importance of missionary labor along right lines and inspired by the true spirit of universal brotherhood. The possession of truth implies responsibility for its distribution. Truth is not sectional—I mean, essential truth. It belongs to the world, to all mankind. The spirit of truth is the right missionary spirit and carries with it credentials in that language which is understood by universal intellect and universal reason. The religious community to which I have the honour to belong has from its beginning been a missionary conserving influence, on the one

hand protesting in brotherly love against all forms of conceived error in thought and practice and on the other hand seeking to reconcile all men with the truth. The grievous blunder as I conceive of the Christian missionary movement lies in the fact of dogmatic aggressiveness—a spirit of antagonism to all other religions, which soon graduates into bitter denunciation. It first declares that all men—kind—all human souls—are under the ban of divine displeasure. It declares that all men are conceived in sin and born in iniquity, and denies to human nature every good thing. In this view all men breathe naturally only corruption. The universal mind is a machine of evil and only evil. Its capabilities are toward destruction. Its capacities are reservoirs of darkness and sin. Its aspirations are downward toward perdition, its hopes, ill-founded, are blasting vagaries of corruption. It comes and goes eternally doomed. It cannot help itself and knows no source of help. This, in my view, is the Christian missionary's first postulate and ground of effort for the so-called redemption of mankind.

Its second declaration contains a scheme of redemption—a plan of salvation, which to my thought (and not to mine alone) is as unreasonable and repulsive as its first proposition. It is that, men must be saved through the merits and blood vicariously shed of a saviour. It declares that acceptance of that saviour and reliance in that

vicarious atonement are essential to human deliverance. Without the knowledge of this plan of salvation, it denies all moral possibilities and spiritual regeneration. Ignorance of the name of that saviour is no excuse and refusal to accept the dogmatic terms of salvation serves only to intensify the damnation which is already the birthright of all human souls. The spirit of this Gospel refuses to recognise natural goodness, moral aspirations and spiritual worship emanating from any other source.

On these grounds, not to go into further detail, Christian propagandism is founded. In the face of these declarations, is it to be wondered that the enlightened thought of mankind within and without the Christian fold has begun to question the virtue, the divinity, the humanity even, of such a propagandism? Can one wonder that the question is propounded "Is Christianity a failure," "Are missions failures" and why does the world refuse to accept the salvation thus offered? I have no word to say in depreciation of the supposed personal character and life of him who is claimed by these dogmatists to be the saviour of the world. I honor and respect all efforts for the uplifting of mankind, no matter under what name. But to claim for him and for his devotion the exclusive virtue and saving grace which these false interpreters of his life declare is, in my view to rob him

of his real glory and rob mankind of the legitimate influence and uplifting virtue of his devotion, and consecration. Admitting the purity of his life, the grandeur of his devotion, the beauty of his character and the truth of his ethical teachings, it yet remains to be said that thousands of years before his birth among men, similar masters appeared who taught the same truth, achieved equal character and injected into the philosophies and thought of mankind the same inspirations and many of them sealed the genuineness of their devotions with their own blood.

Referring to the religion and philosophy of my own people and to the history of the lives of the illustrious prophets and regenerators, whose names are sacred in our thoughts, I have to say that no Christian minister can point to a single moral truth or ethical statement in his new testament of Jesus the Christ that I cannot duplicate a thousand times with even greater emphasis from the sacred books and teachings of our religion antedating as they do the Christian era by thousands upon thousands of years. They have answered for our instruction in spiritual worship, in the moralities of life and in all outward expressions of brotherhood, to this day evolving among us and before our eyes devoted lives, spotless characters, gifted prophets, tireless regenerators, about whose names the white light of glorious immortality ceaselessly shines. I ask you, my



Christian brothers and sisters, to explain to me this truth of history; I ask you to account for all this in the absence of your Christianity on the basis of your fearful dogma, that without the knowledge of your Christ and of your religion no good can come out of any Nazareth.

What then is the proper missionary method? It speaks itself. It is to recognise and build upon the undoubted and unquestionable truth which is found in all religions—the wide world over, even our heathen religions of India. Instead of affirming universal depravity, change the diction and declare for universal goodness at bottom and truth the natural aspiration, longing and desire of every human soul. Instead of basing regeneration deliverance and liberation upon the vicarious atonement of one or more Christs, affirm the right, the power, the privilege, the opportunity of every soul to assert itself by its own exertions, devotions, austerities and worship of the good, begin the ascent toward holiness, happiness and heaven. Dignify the present life by teaching its laws, its opportunities and its possible destinies. Exalt its worth by showing its origin in infinite wisdom and infinite goodness. Increase its pleasures by cultivating its intuitions, its intellectual and moral faculties. Lessen its burdens by recognising its worth, by encouraging its worship of that which is good and by pointing it toward the assured ultimate

goal of triumph and perfect bliss. Induct it into the repose and blessedness of pure thought by educating the thinkable nature the intellectual faculties. Bring to it the knowledge of truth, of power of right of good, by revaling and declaring by such methods the possibilities of its own selfhood. In one sentence, the method I advocate is that of self-recognition—the education of all the faculties of body and of soul, devoutly recognising responsibility to the Infinite or universal good. Such propagandism, whatever it may be supposed to lack, would never want success, would never fail to meet with responsive co-operation in all lands among all people and would from the start and for ever make the world better and better.

---

## SYMBOLISM

---

A LECTURE DELIVERED AT WASHINGTON, D. C.


Before proceeding with the illustrative part of the lecture I shall say something generally on the science of symbolism. The ordinary idea of the Western scholars, with regard to symbols and mythical writings, is that the origin of these things is due to the primitive state of the human mind, that people began as children, in the beginning they formed their thoughts on pictures, and, later on,

came to abstract ideas. Really speaking, this theory has no basis in fact. There cannot be any nation which gives pictures, unless they have a clear idea formed of them. Therefore, the idea comes first, then they illustrate it by the picture and symbols.

There are reasons for using symbols. Why should they not use ordinary sentences in order to convey the higher truths or deeper sciences? I think there are four reasons. One reason is that there are many deeper truths which ought not to be thrown away, as we say pearls should not be thrown to swine. There are many who do not appreciate these truths, and therefore they should be stated in symbolic language. So, secrecy is the first reason. The second reason is that if they were expressed in ordinary language, certain people might get hold of them and use them for injuring other people, and themselves also. So, protection is the second reason. The third reason is permanency. If anything is expressed in ordinary language, after a certain time we are liable to forget it, but if it is in the form of a picture we can remember it longer. The fourth reason is that the effect produced by the symbol is more intense than the impression made by ordinary language. These are the four reasons for mystical words and symbols. All ancient nations used them; Romans, Egyptians and Greeks used

them The Hindus, Persians and Egyptians are noted for their use of symbols. The Rosicrucians, Masons and other secret societies used them No doubt later on they forgot their real meaning. The Hindus from time immemorial have been using the symbolic syllable *Om* which is now interpreted by some to mean the creative, preservative and destructive principles They even think that the pronunciation of this syllable has a very mystical effect on the occult powers of a man. But the true meaning has been lost sight of by the Hindus, although it is still preserved by my community-the Jain community. In the same manner the cross or *Swastika* is misinterpreted by the so-called western expounders of our ancient philosophy The original idea was very high, but later on the people thought the cross represented only the combination of the male and the female principles While we are on the physical plane and our propensities are on the material line we think it is necessary to unite these principles for our spiritual growth. On the higher plane the soul is sexless and, therefore, those who wish to rise higher than the physical plane must get rid of the idea of sex.

I shall now explain the meaning of the Jain *Swastika* by illustrations.



These two lines, A-B and C-D ( the horizontal and vertical ) without anything else would be the Greek cross. We add four other lines as represented in the illustration. Then we add three circles and the crescent, and a circle in the crescent, now the cross is complete. Then expressed partially an idea is misinterpreted. I will give an example. There is a verse ( among the Jains ) of two lines, the meaning of the second being connected with that of the first and these two lines must be interpreted together. The Brahmins, who had been at certain epochs in the history of India inimical to the Jains, got hold of the second line only, which they interpreted to mean " Even if a person is going to be killed by an elephant, he ought not to go into the Jain temple." The idea conveyed by the Brahmin interpreter is that the Jain temple is so bad that one ought not to seek protection in it even if he is on the point of being killed by an elephant. If you take the first

line with it then the whole meaning is changed. It is this —“ When a person has killed an animal, or any living thing or has returned from an immoral house, or a vicious place, or if he has drunk wine, *then* he ought not to pollute the Jain temple even if he is followed by an elephant. So, in the case of the *Swastika*—if you take only the cross and side lines you cannot have the full meaning, while if the circles and crescent are added you have the whole before you. The idea is there are four grades of existence of souls in the material universe. The first is the lowest state. When the soul evolves from that state it comes to the next stage—the plant, the earth, the animal life which is lower than the human life, then evolves to the third stage, the human life. Then the fourth stage, the celestial. I use the word celestial, to mean the life of other worlds than our own. All these graduations are combinations on different scales of matter and soul. The spiritual plane is that in which the soul is entirely freed from the bonds of matter. In order to reach that plane you must strive to possess the three jewels (the circles) right belief, right knowledge, right conduct. When you get these you are on the right path. Otherwise, there is no settled course for you, you are, as it were, tossed indiscriminately in a large river and do not know where you are going. If you have possession of the jewels your basis is sure. When you have these three things, right belief, right

knowledge, right conduct, you will certainly go upwards higher and higher until you reach the state of liberation. That we represent by the crescent. Why ? Because the crescent is the first form of the rising moon, it is the representation of a form which is going to grow larger and larger. When the soul has reached this stage it is omniscient. When it has reached its full consciousness its horizon becomes larger and larger. The interpretation, according to the Jain view of the cross has nothing to do with the combination of the male and female principle. Worship of the male and female principles—ideas based on sex lowest even on the emotional plane can never raise us higher than the male and the female.

We go to the temple every day in the morning, we make such symbols ( *Swastika* ) when we enter the temple. The object of doing this is that this sign must remind us of the great principle that in order to avoid the round of mundane existence one must have the three jewels and then reach the ultimate good. These symbols intensify our thoughts and make them more permanent.

The horizontal and perpendicular lines would represent spirit and matter.

The circle in the crescent represents the state the soul reaches; when it has full consciousness and lives apart from matter it is liberated.

I visited the Smithsonian Institution the other day and saw many of these crosses. It is called *Swastika*. That literally means a sign of good luck. Several of those I saw, Dr. Wilson told me had been found in the Southern States. These signs are found made on pottery, and on articles of daily use. The idea is that people believe this sign will give them good luck. The implements they use to obtain their livelihood are indeed sources of power to them, and therefore, the natural desire would be to put marks on them which, in their belief, would give them prosperity and health. In India they have this kind of a cross on their implements as a sign of good luck.

There are other signs of the Jains. The sacred thread. This is used by the Brahmins as well as the Jains. The Brahmins always connect philosophy of the sacred thread with materialistic views. They say the three rounds represent activity, passivity and grossness, the three properties of primordial matter. We Jains say the three rounds represent the three sets of prophets that have flourished in all ages. There have been innumerable prophets but we take three sets immediately connected with our time—the past, the present, and the future. In the immediate past we had 24, in the present 24, and in the near future there will be 24. Therefore, the three rounds of the sacred thread represent three sets of



prophets who have left their sublime teachings as our heritage. We carry it on our shoulder. It means we carry these teachings on our shoulders and practise them every day. It is a symbol of your willingness to practise and obey the teachings given us by our prophets.

There is another symbol of the Jains, and that is the picture of the elephant and the seven blind man. The Jains have many lecture halls in all parts of India. In towns and cities where numbers of the Jains are living they build halls for the temporary residence of Monks who go about teaching. On the walls of those houses you will find several Pictures; one is the same as that on my class card. When a small boy about eight years old, I was accustomed to attend with my father the sermons of the Jain monks who visited our town from time to time in those days. The sermons were delivered in the lecture hall built especially by our community. On one occasion we went to the hall half an hour earlier than usual, which gave me ample time to look around, which I did with much interest and some curiosity at the paintings on the walls, one picture in particular impressed me and interested me more than all the others. It was a picture of a man suspended in the middle of a well by holding on to a branch of a tree which grew by the side of the well (many of you will recognize this picture as the same

on my class card ) A huge elephant stood at the brink of the well and not being able to reach the man with his mighty trunk, was trying to shake the tree and thus force the man out. Down in the walls of the well were four snakes in an attitude of hissing at the man, as if about to sting him, lower down at the bottom was a huge serpent reaching up towards the man with his great open mouth Two rats, one black, one white, were gnawing at the trunk of the tree to which the man was holding on Higher up on the branch was honey-comb and a swarm of bees The efforts of the elephant to shake the man loose by swaying the limb had caused the honey to trickle down in drops, which were falling on the lips of the man A monk, a teacher of religion in his white monk's garb stood on the opposite side of the well from the elephant, as if offering assistance to escape to the man from the many dangers surrounding him. I could understand all the dangers to which the man was exposed, but I felt assured that there was a deeper meaning to it all, and after gazing a long time at the picture trying to solve its meaning, I appealed to my father. At once he said, "My son, will you be able to understand the meaning even if I explain to you ?" "I think you will," he said, "once upon a time several men were travelling in company through a great forest infested with wild beasts When in the midst of the forest they were attacked by a band of robbers, they all fled for their

lives, running in different directions. This man whom you see suspended in the well was one of the party. He became lost in the forest and could not find his way out. At this juncture, he suddenly saw a huge elephant chasing after him. He knew that unless he found immediate shelter, he would be instantly killed. As he ran, he saw at a short distance ahead of him an open space in the forest and in this was a great well (some of our wells in India are 30 to 40 feet or more across). He saw his situation and knew the only possible escape from instant death by the elephant was to take refuge in the well so he leaped in, but as he did so, he caught on to the limb of the tree which overhung the well, here he hung to the branch, with the honey dropping into his mouth when the monk came by and offered to assist him to escape the certain death that threatened him from all sides, but he refused the assistance of the monk saying I am quite content now. The elephant cannot reach me, I shall not fall, I have a firm hold on this branch, and do you not see the honey dropping into my mouth?—it is very sweet and I am quite happy. Leave me to enjoy this sweet in my own way.” The monk showed the man the folly of holding on to a limb that two rats were gnawing apart, and the huge serpent at the bottom ready to swallow him; but the man persisted in remaining where he was, safe from the great elephant. Saying it would take a long time for two small rats to gnaw

# Madhu-Bindu



सर्वविषयसेवायामन्यत्र सर्वादायि।  
सुखं विषयसेवायामन्यत्र मधुबिन्दुसुखं॥



off a trunk of a tree, that he was not alarmed at such small things; besides, he wished to enjoy the delicious honey. And this is the whole drama represented in the picture," said my father. This was very interesting to me, but I was not satisfied, and I said to my father—"Surely there must be a meaning to this drama. Will you not tell me the meaning?" And he did when he saw I desired so earnestly to know

He said "The picture is symbolical. The great forest is the world. The man in the well is the ordinary worldly man. The well with its dangers is the life of that man, over which all men are suspended who care for nothing beyond the present life. The elephant after him is death. The great serpent at the bottom of the well is the lowest existence to which those go, who will not make an effort to escape and who waste their forces in a useless or evil life with no effort or desire to rise to a higher life—who live for the present life only. The four snakes in the walls of the well are the symbols of Anger, Vanity, Deceit and Greediness. The trunk of the tree represents the short duration of our earthly life. The two rats, black and white, represent time (our month is divided into the light half and the dark half) which exhausts our earthly duration. The bees in the honey-comb are the organs of senses—the honey drops represent the sensuous pleasures, and the

monk represents the Truth—Religion So the whole symbol means this that the ordinary man of the world thinks he will not be cut off from life at once, satisfies himself by enjoying the sensuous pleasures derived from the senses, and does not care to receive the truths offered by true philosophy; he being influenced by sentiments of anger, vanity, deceit and greediness represented by the four serpents'' I was quite astonished with this explanation of the picture and this is the view of life taken by the Hindus I was not 8 years old then. Twenty years later (only a few months ago) I read one of Prof Max Muller's works and was more astonished to see that he also expressed himself in very nearly the same terms. Here are his words —“Our idea of life on earth has always been that of a struggle for existence—a struggle for power and dominion, for wealth and enjoyment. These are the ideas which dominate the history of all nations whose history is known to us. ”

The other symbol is that of seven blind men and the elephant. The seven blind men wanted to know what kind of an animal an elephant was They went together to the place where the elephant was kept. One of them placed his hands on the ears, another on the legs, another on the tail of the elephant, and so on. When they were asked by the people what kind of an animal it was, one of the blind men said. “O, to be

sure, the elephant is like a big winnowing fan." Another blind man said "No, my dear sir, you are wrong. The elephant is like a big round post." The third "You are all mistaken; it is like a tapering stick." The rest gave their different opinions. The proprietor of the elephant said "My friends, you are all mistaken. You have not examined the elephant from all sides. Had you done so, you would not have taken one sided views." In that symbol the Jains show that no one should preach that a certain religion is the whole truth. There is a Jain saying which means that the six schools of philosophy are part and parcel of one organic whole, but if one is taken by itself it becomes a false doctrine.

There is another symbol of the Jains, and that is the mango tree and six persons. They were members of the same club. They wanted to taste the mango fruit, and went to a mango grove. They approached a ceration tree, and one said "These are very beautiful and very delicious, and we must cut down the tree." Another said "We don't want all the mangoes, let us cut the principal branch. And another said "Let us take a smaller branch." And another "We don't want even so many, we will take one minor branch, that will be enough for us." The last said "We don't want even so many. What is the use of destroying or cutting the tree:



it is a part of nature, and if you can have sufficient number of mangoes that have fallen to the ground let us take them only and not cut the tree." Some think this to be the symbol of laziness, but it is not. It is teaching the saving of life. It teaches also not to sacrifice too much for a limited purpose. If you have an object in view the means resorted to ought to be commensurate with the end.

I could give you more Jain symbols, but it would take all our time on one line. We will take some Brahmin symbols. Some are common to the Jains too.

The Symbol common to all religions in India is "Om". Which in Brahmin philosophy consists of three letters, A, U, and M. When these three letters are joined together, by the rules of euphony it is sounded OM. The Brahmins explain this symbol to mean the creative, the preservative and the destructive principles. When the letter A is pronounced, the breath comes out from the throat, which signifies emanation or creation. The letter U, keeps the breath in the mouth for a time and, therefore, is the symbol of the preservative principle. The letter M, stops the breath for a time and lets it out through a different channel the nostrils, and symbolizes destruction and regeneration. Instead of dividing this symbol into three letters we Jains divide it into five.

A A A. U M.

Of these five letters, four are vowels, the fifth being a consonant. The whole combination is sounded OM. These five letters are the first letters of five generic names of great personages. The first letter A, is the first letter of Arhut, the highest and perfected prophet, the living human being in the perfected state. While living in this world he acts as the spiritual master of his order. The second letter is the first syllable of another generic word. It signifies bodiless, liberated souls. While the Arhut is living, acting as spiritual master, these are liberated beings after human existence (Not earth-bound spirits). These are liberated souls. The third is the first letter of a class of religious masters who do not stand on as high a level as the others, but are leaders of an order who may reach a higher state. The fourth is the first letter of the class who are disciples, students under religious masters who are going to reach that higher state. The fifth is the first letter of the class which means holy men or holy women. It is sounded OM. When we sound that word we bring before our minds these five classes of beings. We attach spiritual meanings to this symbol, while the Brahmins attach physical energies. If we keep the holy men and women in our minds, then we will rise step by step.


These five personages have peculiar virtues and characteristics. The first has 12, the second 8


qualities, the third 36, the fourth 25, the fifth 27. If you find the first 12 in a human being, then he is an Arhant. If you find the fourth 25 he is of the fourth class, and so on. If he have the fifth 27, then he belongs to the class of holy men and women. All these qualities put together make 108. There are 108 beads in the rosaries we use. The reason is that when we use the rosary, reciting sacred texts and contemplating on the ideas expressed, we keep before our minds these personages these qualities, which assist us in our journey towards the perfected state

We have in the temples of the Hindus many figures of gods and goddesses. In Calcutta, you have heard of one where many animals are sacrificed. That practice has not yet been exterminated from that city. The figure to the ordinary observer is very terrible. The goddess is horrible with a red tongue protruding from her mouth. With little gods and goddesses on each side. On top of the figure is Siva. This is to be explained from the spiritual and material standpoint mixed together. She has 10 arms, all are creative energies, five positive, five negative. These are called creative powers. Those on the right represent the positive aspect, those on the left the negative aspect of the energies. On the right is the figure of the god with a human form and head of an elephant. The goddess on the


right is the goddess of wealth. A man with an animal head must be considered a man with animal propensities, therefore he has by his side the goddess of wealth. On the left the negative side is represented, the spiritual part, and the human form is perfect. The goddess on this side is the goddess of wisdom. She has no necessity for wealth. Even this picture connected with material ideas, in certain ways is a beautiful picture. Later on when people forget the real truth and become engrossed in the external world they thought the energy of the world was not an abstract idea but it was a person they wanted to propitiate those energies, and so they sacrificed animals to the goddess that represented destructive energy. It is continued there. It is a great blot on the peaceful and humane character of the Hindu. The truth has been forgotten by them. Even the sacred writings have been mutilated by them. Many passages are altogether new. The *Sattee*, burning of widows on the funeral pile of their husbands, came to be sanctioned by a passage that has been changed by substituting one letter for another. In this way the sacred writings are interpreted as sanctioning those rights. There are hundreds of thousands of people who interpret the Vedas in the most exoteric sense.

All the different sects and communities of India have different marks on their foreheads. They make those marks with some kind of paste that is fra-


grant. The Jains use sandal wood. They make forms which represent different ideas. Very few people understand the original meaning of these marks. The mark the Jains make on the forehead is of the form of the heart  It is made just between the two eyebrows, in the center. Our physiology tells us there is a center of nerves there, a plexus, which becomes a source of light, or inner, sight. When we go through a course of discipline, moral and spiritual, we see many things through this center which we cannot see by the ordinary vision. When we make that sign we mean it is through this center we are going to have great power of light. Our object in worshipping in the temple is not to acquire wealth, but to acquire that power by the aid of which we can see and know more. We want spiritual possessions.

As the people have different doctrinal beliefs they are represented by different signs. The Brahmins have different signs. They make three streaks  on the forehead. The Jains mean by their heart-sign the religion of the heart. The Brahmins say it represents the three energies, the creative, preservative and destructive. Instead of representing, or keeping in mind the material energies of the world, the Jains say it is the heart that is going to raise us by right living.

Siva, the third in the trinity is a representation of the destructive power and is represented by certain signs in Southern India. The people make signs on their foreheads representing the

the ideas of creation or generation.  There people think that by their material energies they will rise.

In our temples at the time of performing ceremonies, we make marks on tables of wood, marble or metal, one is of an eight-petaled lotus




We locate certain great principles or ideals in all these petals I gave you the generic names of five great personages. The first (1) is put in the middle, Arhut. The second, the liberated, at the top (2), the right of the center (3) the master; the fourth, the religious student, (4) at the bottom, the fifth, the holy man (5) at the left of the center. In the corner petals we locate right knowledge (K), right belief, (B), right conduct (C) and right energy (E).

When we have the rosary in our hand we think of the Arhuts and contemplate on their peculiar

qualities; then we think and contemplate on the principles and qualities of the second, and so on. When we think of these qualities, we cannot think of other things and the mind receives help.

There are symbols of various kinds among the Persians, the Greeks and Romans. The Egyptians have the symbol of the serpent, meaning eternity and the cat meaning the moon. The Romans and Greeks had crosses also long before the crucifixion of Jesus. It must have some deeper idea connected with it. These crosses are found in all countries. The Rosicrucians have also the cross. They represent the meaning in a different way as follows.



The Rosicrucians do not say it is a combination of the male and female principles meeting in the center. If a person practise love, hope, patience, and faith, he will reach the center.

It can be interpreted as the crucifixion of the outer self; that was the original meaning.

The Zoroastrians also have their symbols. They are supposed to worship fire. Fire has its origin in

the sun. The sun was the symbol of spirituality. It was considered the source of spirituality.



According to the views of Hindu scholars the follower of Zoroaster and the Parsees did not agree with the Hindus on certain points and went to Persia and then followed a different religion.

The Brahmins used an intoxicating plant and sung beautiful hymns. The Brahmin ceremony is the origin of the Bacchic custom, or ceremony of drinking wine. It is to protest against this ceremony that the fifth rule of the Buddhists is not to partake of intoxicating drink.

---



## WONDERFUL FEATS OF MEMORY.

---

The late Professor Max Muller, in his "Psychological Religion " says — "To those who are not acquainted with the powers of human memory when well disciplined, or rather when not systematically ruined, as ours has been, it may almost seem incredible that so much of the ancient literature of India should have been composed, and should have survived during so many centuries, before it was finally consigned to writing." It is difficult to believe in the wonderful possibilities of human memory, as our modern psychology does not teach any method of cultivating this faculty, to an extent which we may call miraculous. Now and then we see advertised in literary magazines methods of cultivating memory by artificial means. Oftentimes, they are found to be more tedious than the ordinary methods of repetition. And when one tries the advertised method for some time and fails to accomplish anything he begins to doubt the possibility of training the memory to such an extent that he could perform wonderful feats.

Many wonderful instances of the feats of memory are forthcoming in the history of India. Pre-eminently the literature of the Jain sect, an old religious cult, has chronicled many such instances. Hem-chandra, the famous Jain encyclopædist, is one of them. He lived in the middle of the eleventh century. He was born in the northern part of Western India. His parents were Jains. His mother once took him with her to a Jain monk, when he was six years old. The monk was seated in the monastery on a table-like raised seat with a blanket spread over it. He looked at the boy with some interest, but the latter instead of performing the usual obeisance to the monk made himself comfortable on the seat by the monk's side. This the monk took to be a sign that the boy was going to be a great man. So he asked the mother if she would not give her child to him as his disciple and explained to her the reasons of his proposal. The mother oscillated for some time between parental love and a desire that the boy should be a great benefactor of the Jain sect. Ultimately reason triumphed over emotion and she gave her child to the monk to be initiated as his disciple. Hem-chandra thus entered the life of monkhood at the early age of six. As years went on, he became proficient in the sacred lore and at the age of twenty-one he became the spiritual head of the Jain people. History further tells us that he converted Kumara—pala, a prince

of Gujrat, to the Jain faith. He also became the author of many works, the estimated bulk of which is 35,000,000 couplets, of 32 syllables each. He lived 84 years. One wonders how he was able to compose such a large quantity of new literature. Tradition tells us that it was the usual practice of this great scholar to keep about him several scribes. After breakfast, he would ask about forty of them to take their seats around a tank of ink, with pen and—paper. He would then walk round the tank and first dictate to scribe No. 1 the first verse of a work on Grammar which he would be then composing. While No. 1 is writing it down, the monk would move on, go to scribe No. 2 and dictate to him the first verse of a work on Prosody. In this way, he would dictate to the forty scribes, one after another, the first verse of each of the forty new works which he would be composing at the same time. Having finished the first round he would come again to scribe No 1 and dictate to him the second verse of the work on Grammar, without losing the thread of the plan of the work. Following this system, he would compose forty works on forty different subjects in a few days. The voluminous works, some published, others in manuscript only, of this scholarly monk leave no doubt as to his capacities and the wonderful memory he possessed, in-days when there were no printed books. no system

of spreading information and knowledge through the Press and no convenient mode of transport.

Coming back to our own times, instances are not wanting of marvellous feats of memory. There is a Jain gentleman in Bombay, Mr Raichand Ravji, \* about 35 years old, noted for the wonderful powers of his memory. At the request of his friends, once he gave a public demonstration of his feats, in a public hall before a large number of people. He was taken to the platform and blindfolded. Some thirty or forty books of various sizes were one by one placed in his hands and their titles mentioned. He was asked to remember them. Then a number of about ten figures was given to him, of which he was to find the cube root without using pencil or paper. He was further asked, with his eyes open, to play a game<sup>2</sup> of cards with three gentlemen on the platform. He was also asked to compose, while playing the game, small poem of about thirty lines, giving description of a certain place in India, the condition being that he should bring in the poem in certain stated lines the names of certain foreigners and foreign places, that had nothing to do with the subject of the poem. Then a person who stood at the back of this gentleman at a distance of some twenty feet was to throw pebbles on his back, which he was to count while the game of cards was being played. Lastly, another person

---

\* This man died 2 years ago. Ed

was to ring a bell while all this was going on and Mr. Raichand Ravji was to tell at the end of the game how many times the bell was rung. Then began the game, which took about twenty minutes. At the end of the game he recited his poem, bringing in the names of persons and places given to him. He found the cube root of the ten-figure-number. He told the audience also the exact number of Pebbles thrown at him, and also the number of times the bell was rung. He was then blindfolded again and the books which were placed in his hand, at the beginning of the demonstration, were again placed in his hands, but this time not in the same order as before; he gave the correct titles of all. What shall we call such a person, a giant or a genius? He claims that after reading an ordinary sized book only once he can repeat its contents without looking at it.

Here is another case of the wonderful cultivation of memory Paudit Gattulalji who died only a few years ago was born blind. In his early days, there being no system or institution for teaching the blind to read, he never had that training. What he learned was through reading by others. But his memory was so wonderful that after hearing a passage once, he could reproduce it at any time. He became the head of the Vaishnava community in Bombay and received the highest respect from his co-religionists all over India. He gave many public

demonstrations of what his memory could perform. He is the author of several works on the Vaishnava faith.

There are a number of such persons in India whose feats of memory are as wonderful as those related about What is the secret in regard to the uncommon faculty of such persons? The following is the most rational explanation that can be offered

The phenomena of memory obey the law of the indestructibility of force, of the conservation of energy, which is one of the most important laws of the universe Nothing is lost ; nothing is annihilated ; nothing that exists can ever cease to be In Natural Philosophy this an admitted fact It is such a fundamental law that the whole of Natural Philosophy is considered but a commentary on it. In morals, we are not in the habit of applying this principle we are commonly so accustomed to regard all moral and mental occurrences as the results of chance, and as subject to no laws, that many at least admit the annihilation of that which once was a state of consciousness to be possible Yet annihilation, absolute destruction, is as inadmissible in the moral as it is in the physical world ; and but little reflection or reason is needed to see that as all phenomena are but states of some reality, of something that exists, the states may change into other states, but it is alike impossible for something

to become nothing, or for nothing to become something. Such a miracle can neither be conceived by reason nor justified by experience. We may, indeed, state such a proposition verbally; but so soon as we passed from words to things, from vagueness to Precision from the imaginary to the real, we cannot form an idea of any such annihilation in the objective or the subjective world

Nor are the considerations in favour of the indestructibility of our perceptions, ideas, and other phenomena of consciousness merely of a theoretical nature; there are also facts which, however strange they may appear at first sight, are very simple, if we bear in mind that in the mental world, as elsewhere, nothing perishes. Medical and psychological works cite numerous cases where languages apparently altogether forgotten or memories apparently effaced, are suddenly brought back to consciousness by a nervous disorder, by fever, opium, hasheesh, or simply by intoxication. Coleridge tells a story of a servant-maid, who, in a fever, spoke Greek, Hebrew and Latin. It was found that this girl had lived with an old Protestant pastor; that it had been the old man's custom for years to walk up and down a passage in his house into which the kitchen door opened and to read to himself with a loud voice out of his favourite books, passages

from which were identified with those spoken by the girl in her fever. Erasmus mentions an Italian who spoke German, though he had forgotten that language for twenty years ; there is also a case recorded of a butcher's boy who, when in sane, recited passages from the Phedre which he had heard only once. All these facts are so well-known that they need only here be cited ; they, with many others, prove that in the very depths of the soul there exists many a memory which seemed to have vanished for ever

An idea that has passed away from consciousness is not destroyed, but only transformed. Instead of being a present idea, it becomes a residuum, representing a certain tendency of the mind exactly proportioned to the energy of the original idea. The existence of ideas in an unconscious state might, therefore, be regarded as a state of perfect equilibrium. In other words, whenever any piece of information or knowledge comes to use like a flash, it is because that information or that knowledge was acquired by us sometimes in the past, it having gone into a latent state in the mean-time.

If such wonderful revival of a former consciousness or memory can be accomplished in an unconscious or unintentional way, there must be a science



which can teach how to accomplish the same result consciously and intentionally. Electricity existed even before the science of electricity was formulated; only in those primitive days people did not know its laws. It is claimed by the Jains of India that they possess a perfect system of philosophy, which teaches how to cultivate and perform wonderful feats of memory. We may only hope that our psychologists would get hold of a learned Jain and find out from him the methods and secrets of this wonderful science

---

## ESSENTIAL PHILOSOPHY OF HINDUISM BUDDHISM AND JAINISM.

---

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

From the mystic philosophy of India, we pass to the everyday philosophy of the three great sects of the East, the Hindus, the Buddhists and the Jains

When I was a small boy, about eight years old, I used to go with my father to hear the sermons of a Jain monk who happened to visit our town in those days. He delivered his sermons in a lecture hall specially built by my community. On one day, we went to the lecture hall half an hour earlier than the appointed time. After taking our seats, I began to look with curiosity at some paintings on the walls of the lecture hall. One of them struck me most. It was the picture of a man holding steadfast the branch of a huge banian tree in the midst of a large well and an elephant standing at the brink of the well and trying with its mighty trunk to catch the man. At the bottom of the well there was a huge

boa with its mouth open, ready to swallow the man. On each side of the well at the bottom there were four snakes with their hoods expanded, furiously hissing and ready to sting the man. Two rats—one white and one black were eating away the trunk of the banian tree. On the top of a branch there was a honey-comb with a swarm of bees. The elephant while trying to catch the man moved that branch to and fro and caused some drops of honey to fall on the lips of the man. A monk—the minister of religion stood on the opposite side of the elephant in his white garments, offering help to rescue the man from the well and from the attack of the elephant. And all this was in the midst of a forest. I could not understand the meaning of the painting. I gazed at it for five minutes, ten minutes, fifteen minutes and still could not understand the meaning. Then I asked my father, “Papa, this picture seems to be very strange, what does it mean?” He at once said “will you be able to understand it, even if I tell you what it is; I think you will. Once upon a time this man whom you see in the picture hanging in the well was travelling from place to place with a party and they happened to pass through a thick forest full of wild beasts and robbers. While they were in the midst of the forest, some robbers attacked them. They all fled for their lives in different directions; this man too did the same but he lost his

track and while he looked back to see where he was, he saw that this elephant was furiously running after him. He saw that if he could not find some shelter, he would be instantly killed by the elephant. He looked in other directions and saw this well. He thought—this elephant is sure to kill me, I may perhaps save myself by jumping into the well. Off he jumps into the well and gets hold of one of the branches of the banian tree which you see in the well. At the bottom he saw that huge boa ready to swallow him; on the four sides of the well at the bottom he saw four snakes hissing at him. The two rats are eating away the trunk of the tree and from the honey-comb at the top of the branch some drops of honey are falling on his lips. Just at this time, a minister of religion [like our respected brother Jones] happens to come there and offers him help to rescue him from the well, but the fellow seems quite satisfied with his lot while having the sweet taste of honey drops. He does not realize the fact that the whole trunk of the tree will be eaten away by the rats and then he would have no support at all; he would have to fall down to be swallowed by the cobra. This whole drama is represented in this picture." I said to my father, "Well, but what is the meaning of all this drama," he said, "It is all symbolical. This man in the well in this forest is the ordinary wordly man. The elephant that ran after him is death; the well is

this earthly life; the boa is the symbol of the lowest state of existence. The four snakes are the symbols of Anger, Vanity, Deceit and Greediness. The trunk of the banian tree is the short duration of our earthly life. The two rats, white and black represent time, the light half and dark half of the month which exhaust our earthly duration. The bees in the honey-comb are the organs of senses and the honey-drops represent the sensuous pleasures. And the minister represents the true religion. So the whole thing comes to this. The common man of the world, thinking that his life will be cut off at any time by death satisfies himself by enjoying the sensuous pleasures derived from the senses and does not care to receive the truths offered by true philosophy, he being influenced by sentiments of anger, vanity, deceit and greediness represented by the four snakes."

I was perfectly astonished at this explanation of the picture and of the view of life taken by the Hindus. This was when I was eight years old. Twenty years after that, only the other day I happened to read one of Professor Max Muller's work, and I was much more astonished to see that he also expressed himself in pretty nearly the same terms. Here are his views.—Our idea of life on earth has always been that of a struggle for existence, a struggle for power and dominion, for wealth and enjoyment. These are the ideas which dominate the history of

all nations whose history is known to us. Our own sympathies also are almost entirely on that side. But was man placed on this earth for that one purpose only ? Can we not imagine a different purpose, particularly under conditions such as existed for many centuries in India and nowhere else ? In India the necessaries of life were few, and those which existed were supplied without much exertion on the part of man by a bountiful nature. Clothing scanty as it was, was easily provided. Life in the open air or in the shades of the forest was more delightful than life in cottages or palaces. The danger of inroads from foreign countries was never dreamt of before the time of Darius and Alexander, and then on one side only, on the North, while more than a silver streak protected all around the far stretching shores of the country. Why should the ancient inhabitants of India not have accepted their lot ? Was it so very unnatural for them, endowed as they were, with a transcendent intellect, to look upon this life not as an arena for gladiatorial strife and combat, or as a market for cheating and huckstering, but as a resting place, a mere waiting room at a station on a journey leading them from the known to the unknown, but exciting for that very reason their utmost curiosity as to whence they came and whither they were going. So in those palmy days of India a large class of people, not only the priestly class but the nobility also, not only men but women also

never looked upon their life on earth as something real. What was real to them was the invisible, the life to come. What formed the *theme* of their conversations, what formed the subject of their meditations was the real that alone lent some kind of reality to this unreal phenomenal world. Whoever was supposed to have caught a new ray of truth was visited by young and old, was honored by princes and kings, nay was looked upon as holding a position far above that of kings and princes.

I told you last Sunday that out of these rays of truth based on the Vedic literature of the Hindus six systems of philosophy arose. The first was the Nyaya system. The followers of that philosophy hoped by cultivating the instruments of knowledge—perception, Inference, Analogy, Testimony to reach final beatitude by right inquiry. They generalized from the phenomena of life to an extra cosmic Deity or superhuman powers commanding our homage and worship. The inanimate universe, including the soul and mind of man, they left to itself and believed to be the result of an act of divine creation. The Vaisheshikas accepted the generalizations of Nyaya but went a step further in analysing the nature of material existence. They acknowledged the existence of an extra cosmic Deity but like Gassendi nearly dropped the idea and busied themselves with the atoms and their nature. With them

the universe began with atoms—infinite and eternal moved by the will of the divine power. Thus as Gautam, the author of Nyaya built up the metaphysics, Kanada the author of Vaisheshika supplied the physics of a philosophy which generally goes under the name of Dialectic philosophy. A philosophy built upon mere abstractions and generalizations from phenomena, which can in reality never be individually generalized from, must result in pure atheism or anthropomorphic Deism Principal Caird says in his philosophy of religion. "Generalization, so far from apprehending reality is a process which takes us away from it, and the further it advances, the more abstract our thought becomes, the further do we recede from the real objective truth of things." If the Nyaya and Vaisheshika thus represent the positive side of the method of abstract generalization, the Charvakas the materialists represent the negative aspect. They were not far from the modern materialists when they maintained life, thought or energy to be the result of material organization, but their philosophy made few disciples and converted none. All experience is in favour of declaring that *dead* matter is never capable of producing life and even the best representatives of modern physical science stand confessed of their ignorance of the real nature of matter and energy *per se*, at the altar of eternal truth Even Mr. Huxley says, "In perfect strictness it is true that chemical investigation can tell us little



or nothing directly of the composition of living matter and it is also in strictness true that we know nothing about the composition of any body whatever as it is." Observation has proved that every atom of matter is full of energy in one form or another. So that instead of postponing the appearance of mind to the last stage of material organization as the modern evolutionists have done, it is more consistent with reason to regard it as co-existent. The Nyaya philosophy regarded it as the very beginning but the intermeddling of a God isolated from his creation did not satisfy subsequent reasoners, such philosophy being subversive of that real knowledge which must by the very conditions of knowledge or thought look upon thought and intelligent being as inseparable. It is in some such train of reasoning that we find an explanation of *Prakriti* and *Purusha* of Kapila's Sankhya. The Sankhyas had advanced further if advance it may be called, than the Vaiseshikas in their analysis of matter and had demonstrated a theory of evolution, anything more entirely novel than which even the Vedanta has not to teach. They postulated *Prakriti* or undifferentiated cosmic matter as the eternal basis of cosmic evolution; and they definitely enumerated the various evolving stages of this matter with its properties, being here upon called the Sankhyas. They however thought it would be impossible to postulate matter without mind and they therefore laid down an eternal union

between *Purusha* or the eternal mind and *Prakriti* in all its stages of evolution. They attributed no functions to *Purusha* and regarded the evolutions of *Prakriti* for this *Purusha* who was ever in it but never of it, trying in this manner to satisfy the necessity of philosophic thought. The Sankhyas will thus be nearer the truth, nearer because they were, by postulating two entities in the form of *Prakriti* and *Purusha*, both interdependent so to speak, indirectly precluding the possibility of *Moksha*, salvation and initiating a principle which would lead to false results in practical ethics. Satvagana or purity the first of the three properties of matter is after all a kind of material purity in as much as that property is inseparable from *Prakriti* and to set this up as a standard to which men should even try to reach is only to point a way to re-incarnation or fresh evolution (of the individual self) and misery. Contemplation of *Prakriti* can raise the contemplation no higher than *Prakriti*, the source of all mundane existence and misery. Patanjali not satisfied with the practical side of Sankhya set up a kind of training, generally known as *Yoga* for attaining the state of eternal bliss and postulated a kind of God, for purposes of contemplation. His *Yoga* led to marvellous physical results but nothing more. It again landed the student in *Prakriti* only on a higher stage of it. The Vedanta philosophy while trying to meet this diffi-

culty, went off at a tangent in a region to be conscious of which is an utter impossibility. Of Buddhism and Jainism we shall judge later on.

The details of these philosophies will interest none but a student of metaphysics. My purpose therefore lies in giving you the essential principles which make up what are known as Hinduism, Buddhism and Jainism. In the first place, therefore, let us see what Hinduism says as to the existence and nature of soul for the theory of soul must be the foundation of every religion which deserves a name. In all ages it has been supposed that there is something divine in man; that there is in him the non-phenomenal agent on whom the phenomenal attributes of feeling, thinking and willing depend. To the Hindu philosophers this agent was self-evident (*Svayamprakasha*). Of course, this agent, which they called Self was not discovered in a day. We see in the Upanishads many attempts to discover and grasp it. I shall give you a kind of allegory representing the search after this Self from the Chhandogya Upanishad. It is a dialogue supposed to have taken place between Prajapati, the lord of creation, and Indra, as representing the *Devas* the bright gods and Virochna representing the *Asuras*, the opponents of the *Devas*. Prajapati is said to have uttered the following sentence. "The Self (Atman) free from sin, free from age, from death and grief, from hunger

and thirst, which desires nothing but what it ought to desire and imagines nothing but what it out to imagine, that is what we search out, that is what we must try to understand. He who has searched out that Self and understands it obtains all worlds and desires—that is final beatitude.

The gods and the demons both heard these words and said —“ Well, let us search for that Self by which if one has searched it, all worlds and all desires are obtained.” Thus saying Indra went from the *Devas*, Virochana from the demons and both without having communicated with each other, holding fuel in their hands as is the custom with pupils approaching their master. They dwelt there as pupils for thirty two years and served Prajapati. At the end of 32 years Prajapati turns his face to them and asks —“ For what purpose have you been both dwelling here ? ” They replied that they had heard the saying of Prajapati and that they had both dwelt near him because they wished to know the Self.” Prajapati like many of the ancient sages does not show himself inclined to part with his knowledge at once. He gives them several answers which though not exactly wrong are equivocal and open to a wrong interpretation. He says first “ The person that is seen in the eye, that is the Self. This is what I have said; this is the immortal, the fearless, This is Brahman.” If the pupils had understood this as meant for the person

that sees through the eye, or out of the eye, they would have received a right though indirect idea of the Self. But, when they thought that the reflection of man in the eye of another person was meant, they were wrong. And they evidently took it in the latter sense, for they asked—"Sir, he who is perceived in the water and he who is perceived in a mirror, who is he?" Prajapati replied—He, the Self himself indeed is seen in all these. Look at yourself in a pan of water, and whatever you do not understand of yourself, come and tell me. They looked in the water pan. Then Prajapati said "what do you see." They said "We both see the Self thus altogether, a picture even to the very hairs and nails." Prajapati then said "After you have adorned yourselves, have put on your best clothes and cleansed yourselves, look again into the water pan." They did so and looked into the water pan. Prajapati says "what do you see?" They said "Just as we are, well-adorned, with our best clothes and clean, thus we are both there, Sir, well adorned with our best clothes and clean." Prajapati said "that is the Self, that is the immortal, the fearless, this is Brahman." They both went away satisfied in their hearts.

Prajapati thought "they both go away without having perceived and without having known the Self and whoever of these two whether gods or demons

will follow this doctrine will perish '' Now Virochana satisfied in his heart went to the demons and preached that doctrine to them, that the Self alone is to be worshipped, that the Self alone is to be served and that he who worships the Self and serves the Self gains both worlds, this and the next

Therefore they call even now a man who does not give alms here who has no faith and offers no sacrifices an *Asura*, a demon; for this is the doctrine of demons. They deck out the body of the dead with perfumes, flowers and fine raiment by way of ornament and think they will thus conquer the world But Indra before he had returned to the gods saw this difficulty As this Self ( the shadow in the water, is well adorned when the body is well adorned, well-dressed when the body is well dressed, well cleaned when the body is well cleaned, that Self will also be blind if the body is blind, lame if the body is lame, crippled if the body is crippled, and perish in fact as soon as the body perishes; therefore I see no good in this doctrine Taking fuel in his hand he went again as a pupil to Prajapati. Prajapati said to him ''Well, Indra, you went away with Virochana, quite satisfied in your heart, what has brought you back ?'' Indra said ''Sir, as this Self is well adorned when the body is well adorned, well dressed when the body is well dressed etc , that Self will also be blind when the body is blind? Therefore I see no good in this

doctrine." So it is indeed, Prajapati said but I shall explain the true Self further to you. "Live with me another thirty two years." He lived with him another thirty two years and then Prajapati said, "He who moves about happy in dreams, he is the Self, this is the immortal, the fearless, this is Brahman." Then Indra went away satisfied in his heart But before he had returned to the gods, he saw this difficulty 'Although it is true that that Self is not blind even if the body is blind, nor lame if the body is lame though it is true that that Self is not rendered faulty by the faults of the body, nor struck when the body is struck, nor lamed when the body is lamed, yet it is as if they struck him the Self in dreams as if they chased him. He becomes even conscious as it were, of pain and sheds tears in dreams. Therefore I see no good in this."

Taking fuel in his hands he went again as a pupil to Prajapati. Prajapati said. "Well Indra, you went away satisfied in your heart, what has brought you back?" Indra told him his difficulty. Then Prajapati said. "So it is indeed, Indra. But I shall explain the true Self further to you. Live with me another thirty two years" He lived with him another thirty two years Then Prajapati said "When a man being asleep, reposing and at perfect rest, sees no dreams, that is the Self, this is the immortal the fearless, this Brahman." Indra went away, quite

pleased; but before he had returned to the gods he thought. "Truly, in this dreamless repose he does not know his Self that he is I, nor does he know anything that exists. He is gone to utter annihilation. So I see no good in this." Taking fuel in his hands he once more went to Prajapati as his pupil. Prajapati again asked "Well Indra, what again has brought you back?" He again told him his difficulty. Prajapati said "So it is indeed, Indra; I shall explain the true Self further to you and nothing more than this Live here another five years." He lived there for another five years. This made in all 101 years. Prajapati then said: "Indra this body is mortal and always held by death. It is the abode of that Self which is immortal and without body. When in the body by thinking this body is I and I am this body, the Self is held by pleasure and pain So long as he is in the body he cannot get free from pleasure and pain. But when he is free of the body, when he knows himself different from the body, then neither pleasure nor pain touches him The wind is without body, the cloud, lightning and thunder are without body (without hands, feet etc) Now as these arising from the heavenly ether appear in their own form, as soon as they have approached the highest light, thus does that serene being, arising from this body, appear in its own form, as soon as it has approached the highest light—the knowledge of



the Self. He in that state is the highest person. He moves about there laughing, playing and rejoicing, be it with women, carriages or relations, never minding the body into which he was born. Like a horse attached to a cart, the spirit is attached to the body. Now where the sight has entered into the void, there is the person of the eye, the eye itself is but the instrument of seeing. He who knows let me smell this, he is the Self, the nose is but the instrument of smelling. He who says—let me say this—He is the Self, the tongue is but the instrument of saying. He who knows, let me hear this—he is the Self, the ear is but the instrument of hearing. He who knows let me think this,—he is the Self, the mind is but the divine eye. He is the Self, seeing these pleasures (which to others are hidden like a buried treasure of gold) through his divine eye i. e. through the mind rejoices. He who knows that Self and understands it, obtains all worlds and all desires." Indra was satisfied by this explanation, went to the gods and taught them this doctrine.

This dialogue is so plain that I need not explain its esoteric meaning. It is on this dialouge that the various sub-divisions of the vedantic philosophy have offered different interpretations. We will take the interpretation of the most prominent Vedantist, Shankara. Shankara says that is quite true as Prajapati said that the true Self has nothing to do

with the body. For the body is mortal but the Self is not mortal. The Self dwells in the body and as long as he thinks that the body is I and I am body, the Self is enthralled by pleasure and pain, it is not perfect, it is not the immortal Self. But as soon as the Self knows that he is independent of the body and becomes free from it, not by death but by knowledge, then he suffers no longer, neither pain nor pleasure can touch him. When he has approached this highest light of knowledge, then there is perfect serenity. He knows himself to be the highest Self and therefore is the highest Self, and though while life lasts, he moves about among the pleasant sights of the world, he does not mind them, they concern his body only, or his bodily Self, his ego, not his absolute Self. He goes a step further and lays down that it is not the individual soul that is the highest self, the highest Self is not different from Brahma; the interposition of ignorance, rescience or illusion leads the individual Self to believe that he is separate from Brahma, as soon as ignorance is removed, he is Brahma. He does not become Brahma, for really he was nothing less than Brahma. A post in darkness may seem to be a thief to a person but when the darkness is removed he realises that fact that it is a post and not a thief. On the disappearance of darkness, the object which was seen does not become a post but the fact is realised that it is and has ever

been a post. In the same manner, the individual Self does not become the highest Self; only the truth comes out that it is the highest self.

This is the doctrine of the Highly philosophical Hindu. Let us now turn to Buddha and see what he says as to the existence and nature of soul. Buddha's merit consists not in promulgating a special theory of his own as to the nature or existence of soul but in avoiding the metaphysical and subtle disputation of the Brahmans. His sarcasm against this sort of discussion appears to be very bold as he read it in the Tevijja Sutta. He says to a Brahman named Vasettha—"Then you say, Vasettha, that not one of the Brahmans, or of their teachers, or of their pupils have ever seen Brahma face to face. And that even Rishis of old, the utterers of the ancient verse which the Brahmans of to-day so carefully intone and recite precisely as they have been handed down—even they deed not pretend to know or to have seen where or whence or whither *Brahman* is. So that the Brahman versed in the three Vedas have forsooth said thus "To a state of union with that which we know not and have not seen we can show the way and can say; 'this is the straight path, this is the direct way which leads him who acts according to him, into a state of union with Brahman.'"

"Now what do you think, Vasettha? Does it not follow, this being so, that the talk of the Brah-

mans, versed though they be in the three Vedas, is foolish talk? Verily Vasettha that Brahmans versed in the three Vedas should be able to show the way to a state of union with that which they do not know, neither have seen—such a condition of things has no existence. As when a string of blind men are clinging one to the other, neither can the foremost see nor can the middle one see, nor can the hindmost see, just so is the talk of the Brahmans versed in the three Vedas.”

What explanation then does Bouddha offer as to the nature of man and his relation to the world around him. In fact, Buddhism does not attempt to solve the problem of the primary origin of all things when Malunka asked Buddha whether the existence of the world is eternal or not-eternal, he made him no reply. the reason of this was that it was considered by him as an inquiry which tended to no profit. Buddhism takes as its ultimate fact the existence of the material world and of conscious beings living within it and it holds that everything is subject to the law of cause and effect, and that everything is constantly though imperceptibly changing. The whole cosmos—earth, heavens and hell is always tending to renovation or destruction; is always in a course of change, a series of revolutions, or of cycles, of which the beginning and end are unknowable and unknown.

As to the nature of man, Buddha's teaching is that it consists of an assemblage of different properties or qualities or aggregates none of which corresponds to the Hindu or modern notion of soul. These are *Rupa*, forms or material attributes, *Vedanta*, sensation *Sangna* notions or abstract ideas, *Sanskara*, tendencies or potentialities and *Vijnana* i. e., consciousness or mental powers. These aggregates along with hundred and ninety three sub-divisions exhaust all the elements, all the material, intellectual and moral properties and attributes of the individual. There exists nothing apart from these, either fixed principle or soul, or simple or permanent substance of any kind. They unite and arrange themselves so as to form a separate being, undergo incessant modification along with it and dissolve at its death; the individual being throughout a compound of compounds entirely perishes. The influence of its *Karman* alone of its acts survives it and through this the formation of a new group of *Skanthas* or aggregates is immediately effected, a new individual rises into existence in some other world and continues in some degree the first. The Buddhist strictly speaking does not revive but another if I may say so revives in his stead and it is to avert from this other, who is to be only the heir of his *Karma*, the pains of existence that he aspires to *Nirvan*.

Let us now turn to Jainism and see what explanation it offers as to the nature and existence of

soul. While Vedantism says that in reality nothing exists apart from Brahma, that the phenomenal world is an illusory phantom, that the only reality is noumenon—the Brahma, Jainism says that both the noumenon and the phenomenon are real, the one cannot be separated from the other. Reality is not in the one, if considered alone and by itself, nor in the other if considered alone and by itself. The one as well as the other is a part of the reality. So in the Jain philosophy, the existence of both spirit and matter is postulated—both of them existing as separate entities so far as both of them exist as entities, they may be classed under one category of existence, the substance—one the material, the other the spiritual. Both of them have their qualities and modifications. But while the Vedantist says that the modification of a substance is a phenomenon and therefore unreal and the substance itself is the only reality, a Jain says that substance and its modification are inseparable. Though a substance is different from its modification, neither of them can exist without the other. Though gold may be said to be in a sense different from gold ring, the gold ring does not exist apart from gold, nor do you find gold existing separate from some modification or form. When an old form or modification is destroyed, a new one is produced and in both cases we have the same substance. This leads us to the Jain theory of the origin of the Universe. Jainism has two ways of looking

at things—one called the *Dravyarthika Naya* and the other the *Paryayarthika Naya*. The production of a gold ring is the production of something not previously existing ( at least not as a ring ) if we think of it from the latter point of view *i. e.* as a *Paryaya* or modification, while it is not the production of something not previously existing, when we look at it from the former point of view *i. e.* as a *Dravya* or substance. So the Universe looked upon as a totality is eternal, when looked upon in its several parts and modifications there is in it creation and destruction every moment. The Jain philosophy classifies the whole cosmos under two heads *Jiva* and *Ajiva*—sentient or conscious, and insentient or unconscious. The sentient or conscious being sullied by its contact with the insentient or unconscious travels from body to body. When this unnecessary contact is removed, the conscious will shine forth in its bliss and that state is its final emancipation.

This brings us to the doctrine of re-incarnation and *Karma*. Although this doctrine is rejected throughout Europe and America by the Christians, it is accepted by the majority of mankind at the present day. It has been held as true by the mightiest Eastern nations. The ancient civilization of Egypt was built upon this doctrine and it was handed over to Pythagoras, Empedocles, Plato, Virgil and Ovid who scattered it through Greece and

Italy. It is the keynote of Plato's philosophy when he says that all knowledge is reminiscence. It was wholly adopted by the Neo Platonists like Plotinus and Proclus. The hundreds of millions of Hindus, Buddhists and Jains have made that doctrine the foundation of their philosophy, religion, government and social institutions. It was a cardinal point in the religion of the Persian magi. The doctrine of Metempsychosis was an essential principle of the Druid faith and was impressed upon your forefathers, the Celts, the Gauls and the Britons. Among the Arab philosophers it was a favorite idea. The rites and ceremonies of the Romans, Druids and Hebrews expressed this truth forcibly. The Jains adopted it after the Babylonian captivity. John the Baptist was to them a second Elijah. Jesus was thought to be a re-appearance of John the Baptist or one of the old prophets. The Roman Catholic purgatory seems to be a make shift, contrived to take its place. Philosophers like Kant, Schelling and Schopenhauer have upheld this doctrine. Theologians like Julius Muller, Dorner and Edward Beecher have maintained it. And to-day it reigns over the Burman, Siamese, Chinese, Japanese, Tartar, Tibetan, East Indian and Ceylonese including at least 750 millions of mankind and nearly two thirds of the human race. It is not wonderful then that this great and grand philosophical deduction which the Hindus, Buddhists and Jains gave to the world centuries



and centuries before the Christian Era should or could be blotted out of existence from the Western and European world by the soul-blighting and absurd dogmas of the dark ages that supervened ? By the persecution of wise men and destruction of innumerable works in the library of Consiantinople, the Church hierarchy managed to plunge the whole of Europe into mental darkness which has given the world the black record of the inquisition and the loss of millions of human lives through religious wars and persecutions.

What is re-incarnation ? Re-incarnation is the doctrine that souls enter this life not as a fresh creation, but after a long course of previous existences and will have to pass through many before it reaches its final destination. Our age is the age of opinions. Instead of thinking ourselves, we allow others to think for us. If I can quote passages from Ralph Waldo Emerson or from Lord Tennyson's poems or from the Bible in favour of a certain theory no argument will be necessary to prove it. But if I quote a passage from my Bible, you will say you won't believe in its truth and will ask me to prove my position logically. I will accept the challenge and prove the truth of my theory, not by a quotation from my Scriptures but logically. We know that the human body is a mechanism not a mechanism like a watch or a steam-engine but a knowing

mechanism, able to control itself. It is controlled not by any external power but by a power within, which we call mind, soul, spirit or ego. The existence of this central power is disputed by none. Materialism declares this central power to be the property of matter, to be the product of molecular activities going on within the brain. This theory only explains how mechanical motions are produced in the brain cells. But machines only produce motions, not judgments. An amœba in search of food pursues no haphazard methods but makes most careful selections of the kind it wants. It will send out its pseudopodia, catch, swallow and digest a struggling infusorium or other nutritious germ; but a mere touch of a grain of sand satisfies it as to its character, when it thrusts it from it in a way that plainly says "That is not good." Oxygen consuming bacteria will cluster around grains of chlorophyl, if exposed to direct sunlight but pay no attention to them in the shade or darkness. They know when the oxygen is being given off. Infusoria guide themselves in hunting their food with apparently as much precision as fish. They avoid obstacles and sometimes undertake to move them out of the way. They reject the innutritious and take the nutritious. These facts, evidently teach that the central energy called the soul power is not the result of a nervous system but *vice versa*. In man this fact becomes most

potent. what particular motion among the molecules of the brain can be postulated as the physical equivalent and causal antecedent of our conceptions of justice, of truth, of moral obligation? The physical brain is limited to motion only, it cannot choose its own mode of motion even. What possible motion in the brain causes the idea I am I? This recognition of a real unit does not vary from the cradle to the grave. From childhood to old age, during the whole course of the total change of all brain molecules I am I is undisturbed. This I am I is the soul. It is this soul which makes memory possible. It has its own consciousness and not the consciousness of any one else, therefore it is a unit existing by itself. The law of the conservation of energy is true in the physical as well as in the spiritual world. Therefore as no atom can be created or destroyed, so also no soul-entity can be created or destroyed. What becomes of soul then after what we call death? No power in the universe can annihilate it. It must exist somewhere. In what state would it exist? Does it at once pass into spiritual existence? If so, there is no justice in hurling all the egos, good, bad or indifferent into spirituality without distinction. Spirituality itself means the existence of spirit pure and simple and there is no sense in asserting that all egos after death live in that state, when we know for a certainty that all of them have lived on this physical

plane different kinds of life. Effects of good or bad acts committed on the physical plane must manifest on the physical plane. The force created by the ego on the physical plane in this life must in some way or other manifest itself after death on the physical plane-be in future life. And if the soul has to pass through other future lives, is it unreasonable to say that it has passed through past lives also? If the soul was created at a time it must also die at death. Whatever begins in time must end in time, If the soul is immortal, it must be immortal at both its ends. It cannot be immortal at one end without being immortal at the other. The idea special creation at birth implies the correlative of annihilation at death It does not stand to reason that from an infinite history the soul enters this world for its first and only physical existence and then shoots off into an endless spiritual existence As Emerson says —We wake and find ourselves on a stair. There are other stairs below us which we seem to have ascended; there are stairs above us, many a one which go upward and out of sight.

Re-incarnation is the only doctrine which gives a complete solution of the much-disputed question of original sin. There cannot be greater injustice in the world than the fact that I am suffering for the transgression of my ancestor Adonis responsibility for our sin is only a make shift of the theo-

logions. No one but the individual himself can be blamed for his wrong doing. Are not the courts of Law of your United States founded on the ideas of justice? Will any Judge sitting on the throne of justice be justified in accepting the death—the voluntary suicide of Mr. B as the proper retribution for the murder committed by Mr. A? And if he does that, will not the same Judge be arraigned before a superior Court having knowingly abetted the suicide of B? And still we are asked to believe that the guilt of one man can be washed by the suffering of another.

But the doctrine of re-incarnation assists us most when we look at the inequality and injustice and evil of the world and seek for solution. Why is one man born rich and the other poor? Why is one man born in Central Africa among the cannibals and the other in the peaceful part of India? Why is Queen Victoria born to rule over territories on which the Sun never sets and why is a labourer of Burma born in Burma to work as a slave in an Englishman's tea-garden. What is the cause of this apparent injustice? Even those who believe in the personal creator of the universe must believe in this doctrine of re-incarnation in order to exonerate God from the charge of maliciousness. And now let us see if the Bible of Christendom assists in upholding this doctrine. In the proverbs of Solomon we find

this passage—(Proverbs VIII 22-31). Here all the passages except the last two prove the pre-existence of soul, and not the creation at a certain time. The last two passages even prove a prior physical life. Let us turn to Jeremiah I 5 "Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee, and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee " This shows that the prophets too had existed before. Even in the New Testament there is sufficient evidence for re-incarnation. In John IX 2 a question is put to Jesus by his disciples—Which did sin, this man or his parents that he was born blind? This refers to two popular theories of the time—one that of Moses who taught that the sins of fathers would descend on the children to the third and the fourth generation and the other that of re-incarnation doctrine. He merely says that neither that man's sin nor his father's sin was the cause of his blindness; he does not deny the pre-existence of that man. For in Galatians Ch. VI 7 we find for whatever a man soweth that shall he also the reap. Paul does not here mean that what a man soweth in this physical existence that he shall reap in spiritual existence. For in the next passage he says—For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting. Even the words of Jesus confirm the doctrine. In St Mathew Ch XI he says Verily I

say unto you among them that are born of women there has not risen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding, he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he. And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force. For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John, and if ye will receive it this is Elias, which was far to come." Does not Jesus mean that John was re-incarnated Elias.

It is useless to multiply instances taken from the Bible For every candid Christian student must acknowledge that the truth of the doctrine of Re-incarnation does not depend on a scriptural mention.

But some people may say—If this doctrine is true, how is it that we do not remember our past incarnations. I will ask such people—In what way do we exercise the faculty of memory ? Certainly, so far as we are living in a body, we exercise it through the brain. In passing from one incarnation to the other, the soul does not carry its former brain in the new body. Even during the course of one life, do

we always remember our past doings ? Can any one remember that wonderful epoch the infancy ?

This doctrine of re-incarnation is common to Hinduism, Buddhism and Jainism.

Out of these ideas, all of them have constructed high codes of morality pretty nearly similar to one another.

---



## THE TRUE LAWS OF LIFE.

---

The subject of the True Laws of Life is a very wide one, because these laws cannot be ascertained from a limited observation only of a few facts. We may collect a few facts on the physical basis, we may collect a few facts on the domain of the animal kingdom, and some others which concern human development, but the deductions drawn from these facts must be limited because we do not take into consideration the fact that there are many other planes of consciousness and of existence, and to derive laws concerning life on only a few stages would be altogether insufficient to establish a general rule for our life as human beings. If human beings were totally separated from others beings, if they were to live on a planet without any other life than the human life we might make laws of life after observations only of the human species. Scientists have derived very limited conclusions, right only so far as those limited observations are concerned, and they cannot derive conclusions from the facts beyond the horizon of their observations. Suppose a being

living in the sea and having only one organ, that of touch, to be suddenly developed into a higher being with five senses and placed on the shore. It sees and hears many things which it has not perceived before, having no eyes and ears, how can it understand these things? It will not believe its own senses. Such has been the case with those human beings who have only had limited observations from which to draw their conclusions, when their area is extended to the whole. But if we extend our horizon, if we take into consideration the fact that life is eternal, did not begin at any time, and is not going to end at any time, and that it is going to exist in some state or other at all times, then we can be in a position to derive conclusions valuable to all lives and to all living beings at all times. That is the way in which our philosophers have looked upon life. There is another difference with them, and it is this you have another idea of life that is, the object of life itself is different from their view. Their view may appear mystical to some of these scientists and philosophers, but I only wish to put before you the two views and you can derive conclusions for yourself. As Max Muller has stated in his latest work, the idea of life in all the Western countries is that of a struggle for existence. That has been the idea of life in all the nation with which Europeans and Americans have become acquainted; that is also the idea of life of the En-

glish people. But he also says that that is not the only object to which human beings were placed on this planet, and then he refers to the Hindus, and explains some points of the Hindu religion. Our idea of life has always been different, even in the times of foreign rulers; the idea has been unchanged; even to-day, among the masses, that idea is to be found. The street-sweeper knows that the physical life is only a station in the journey which he considers to be eternal. So far as the state of the soul is concerned it is eternal, that is to say; so far as the physical life is concerned it is non-eternal. He understands that the character depends on the effort of the soul. This idea is to be found in all the philosophies of India. If the idea of life is different and the object is different, then the laws which such a people would establish for their life would also be different. The Hindus have passed through many stages. There is a stage in which we are always attracted by everything material. The Hindus have passed that stage. There is a stage in which the eye is attracted by anything beautiful and attractive; in fact, in that first stage, in order to attract the attention of such a person a picture is necessary. Even in advertising the attention of people can sometimes be drawn only by showing pictures.

But further on, when they think that that is done only from a selfish motive, it does not depend

only on the sight, the person wishes to hear something, and then he begins to reason. In this country indeed there was a time and among ordinary people this is still a time when they are attracted by pictures; but the intelligent, thinking people have passed beyond that stage and wish to hear as well as to see something. This fact is true in this country as in any other, in India as in America. The very fact that we pass from that stage of attraction of the eye to that of the ear is a sign of real progress. To-day in India, if a person is given any newspaper in which there are pictures in connection with the advertisements, and is asked to purchase something from the store, he will say "That person has spent so much money in advertising that his charges will be higher," and in that way he will settle the business. He has passed from the stage in which the eye is attracted to that in which the ear is attracted. Later still we hear eloquent people, and they electrify us as it were on account of their power of speech, and sometimes we come to conclusions while hearing them which would not be our conclusions if it were not for this power. But if we have passed that stage, when we come home we reason on those points and decide them for ourselves. Progress is, really speaking, the object of life. If the object of life is determined we can deal with the laws. First of all we know that life is eternal? second, we know that our object is progress and the

achievement of happiness. The question arises, "What is happiness?" The solution of this question depends on the idea of life. If life means only the organization of the body, the health of the body in this life, then the object of that life would be to keep the body in a healthy condition, and to use all possible means for that purpose. I have said that as we pass from what attracts the eye merely to that which attracts the ear, the reasoning faculties awaken, and we pass from this stage to that in which we are attracted by these things which appeal to the reason. But we know that there are other parts equally necessary with the physical organism to the life of a human being, and that the laws connected with all these faculties are real laws and those which advance happiness, but those which advance the happiness of only one faculty cannot be the right laws. If the object of life is merely happiness for the time being we can derive such happiness from the use of intoxicating liquors, but all people agree that there is no real happiness in this. Sometimes happiness is defined as the greatest good of the greatest number, and there the question comes in, "What is the good, after all?" Most of the professors of political economy think that happiness consists in material prosperity of the people, and a famous English philosopher says that a country may be very progressive, but if there is no philosophy there, if the people do not think on higher

subjects than material and physical welfare, then though its granaries may be full, although there may be hundreds of millions of dollars, pounds or rupees among the people, if philosophy is not there it is a sign of the beast. He says that because only one side of the human nature is advanced, this must be so, but if all sides are taken into consideration and simultaneous progress is made on all, there is real advancement. For this purpose we must progress in the physical, mental and moral nature, and in the spiritual. These are so many different natures of the human being, and when we wish to progress on all these different planes we must consider that there are other living beings besides ourselves, who are related to us, and no laws can be established which do not take into consideration the welfare of these living beings. First take into consideration the physical development. We know that the body must be healthy, that the right kind of food must be taken, the right kind of exercise and nourishment, and the right kind of clothing worn; all these laws we know, and nothing need be said on that subject; but the real laws he have to learn, even in connection with these things, are to help us to understand the deeper meanings of life. Is it only for our health that we are to have a peculiar kind of diet? Has not that something to do with the mental and moral nature? This is where our Hindu philosophy lends us some help. We divide

food into three kinds, and not, as Western scientists do, into two, saying that there is one kind which is nitrogenous and another which is mon-nitrogenous, meaning simply the elements necessary for the support of the human body. We say that there are three kinds, one having the property of passivity and purity, another having the property of activity, and the third having that of grossness; and we make these three divisions because we wish to take into consideration the moral influences of the food. When we eat of a certain kind of food, it may be nutritious so far as the physical part of the body is concerned, but at the same time it may create peculiar emanations from the body which would lower us so far as our moral nature is concerned. Therefore, notwithstanding its nutritious character, we will avoid that kind of food because it is according to our philosophy, of the third kind, having grossness. It may be nutritious, but it may excite the passions, may stimulate and therefore hurt us. The scientists also will say the same thing, but they would say that we should eat that kind of food because it stimulates the palate and therefore does not injure health. Everything is to be judged, from your standpoint of healthy food, simply by its effect on the physical organism. But when we take into consideration the influence of that food on other beings besides ourselves we must take into consideration the nature

of the animal. It is said that there are many elements in animal food which would be nutritious and would help to support the human body, and which are as good as those found in vegetables. Certainly, in fruits and nuts and other things which do not come from the animal we may find these same elements. Still, we say that there is a moral and ethical reason against eating that kind of food, and not only moral but also spiritual reason. In the first place the moral philosophy of our religion says that we have no right to destroy life in any being if we cannot give it to any being. That is the fundamental proposition of our religion. If we follow that rule then any destruction of life is surely to be avoided. But the question may come in. For any kind of food destruction of life is necessary; even in the vegetable there is life, and one must destroy that life in order to prepare food fitted for our diet. We admit that we have to destroy life in order to live, but life is of so many grades, so many classes one higher than another, and if that argument is to be applied, that it is the same to destroy life, whether animal or vegetable, we can also apply the argument to the destruction of human beings; but we all make a distinction there. Why do we not destroy human beings, then? We say that they have souls. But we can never destroy the soul; they only leave the body and go to some other place or into some other body, but according to the opinion



of all religionists the soul is not destroyed with the body, only the relation is broken. The relation is higher and more complicated in the case of the human being than in that of the animal, and higher in animals than in vegetables. We apply this rule to our business affairs; we follow that rule when there are two kinds of business, one more and the other less profitable; we follow that which is more profitable, and we will abandon that in which we must lose a thousand dollars before, that in which we lose a less sum or nothing at all. We also apply this to the case of diet; there are spiritual reasons for avoiding that diet in which certain kinds of feelings and emotions are created. When we consider the mental state in animals, especially when they are prepared for death, just imagine the state even of a chicken at the time of being killed, and its mental condition,—our philosophy in this matter even analyzes this feeling,—we shall see that the mentality or emotion is only a peculiar state of vibrations of the physical matter of the body. If every thought, if every feeling, if every emotion causes a peculiar state of the body, such diet will certainly have its effect on our physical and mental nature. Suppose a merchant dealing in cotton receives a telegram in the city of New York that the price of cotton has fallen fifty per cent. He opens the telegram and reads it, and if you feel his pulse you will find that there

is a very great change in the state of his pulse, although he has done nothing but read a few words on a piece of paper. If this is the effect of the mental upon the physical state of the human being, what would be the effect upon the animal of the knowledge that it was to be killed. Besides this, the animals which are eaten have only taken the elements which are in the vegetable and have assimilated them into their systems. We are in a sufficiently animal condition without adding the animal nature to our own. The physical impurities also and the injurious humors and ethers of an injurious nature are always present in animals which are especially raised for the purpose of food. The turkey is stuffed as it were with food, and is made to appear fat and plump. To try the same experiment with the human being would produce a state of body which you can all imagine. To keep our own body healthy we must take sufficient exercise; if we eat something which is not necessary for us we know that the result will be injurious, and that is the experience of all people in all countries of the world. In more ancient times the life was simpler, but now the discovery of all these different medicines for curing dyspepsia shows that people are suffering from this disease. In this country we know that there are so many kinds of pills and medicines used, we even have those in India now. These things show that not only in America but in all

countries it is because people do not know the rules for diet that we have recourse to artificial means. It is better to follow the rules of diet in the beginning and not have any kind of artificial medicines at all. We have to know so many things even in regard to food, and how much more in regard to the mental, moral, and further on, the spiritual nature ! Take the mind in its ordinary condition ; it can think on so many subjects, and many run in different directions at different times. After being fixed on one point the result is that the mind can be concentrated on one subject more easily. This may be the result either of food or of a different way of living, with regular hours of sleep, a proper amount of exercise, thinking of subjects which excite the mind. The general rule with regard to the development of the mental nature is that we should be compelled some how or other to concentrate our attention on one thing. A person employed in any department of life who is not able to center his thoughts on this department, on his duties, will be dismissed. Even in our business affairs that concentration is necessary, and if for the purpose of making a little money it is necessary that we should do this, how much more is it true in spiritual things ! It is not an easy thing if money is the object, which it takes so much time and labor to accumulate ; it is much more difficult to acquire the spiritual knowledge. This brings us to the science of con-

centration. We have to observe the physical rules and mental rules of concentration. How can we concentrate our attention? In a sense all of us do concentrate; we only do not know that we do it. Many of us are fond of certain things and spend much time in the pursuit of those things. Those who are fond of books will always go to a book-store to see what new books have arrived and purchase and read them. Those who are fond of newspapers will wait when the newspaper comes out of the press, to secure the first copy and read it. If we can concentrate our thoughts on these subjects why should we not be able to concentrate our thoughts on the right subjects? If our object of life is only to secure a few facts in each department, that is the right thing for us to do. If we desire to keep up with the times then we have to know all the things which are necessary for our information, and this can only be done by concentrating our thoughts. If the department of life in which we are engaged is such that our very maintenance depends on the knowledge of these things we must concentrate upon them. Will this really advance us? The ordinary result is that we become fond only of unimportant things, later on, of sensational things and still later of those things which will satisfy our morbid appetites. That is the reason why there are so many sensational novels written. All these things are really injurious. When a murder is committed and the in-

formation concerning it is published, people are, after the extra papers, and read the details with eagerness. Why ? Because on account of the unnatural life they lead their propensities are such that nothing can satisfy them except that kind of information. The further result is that the mind being in a state of vibration and therefore in a state to transmit these vibrations to the ethereal matter outside of us, they are carried to other people and thus these propensities are also transmitted, We have even known that when a murder has been committed in one part of the country, just about the same time many other-murders are committed in other parts of the country How can this be explained but on the hypothesis that the minds of persons saturated with these thoughts are influencing others by means of the transmission of the thoughts to another place where they are received by a person in a similar condition of mind and translated into thoughts which act on the physical organism and produce the desire to commit the crime? From a physiological standpoint we know that the germs from small-pox and other contagious diseases are flying in every direction, and that we should not come into contact with persons who have these diseases. We must take even more care in matters of the mental and moral nature, and thought has indeed a wonderful power of acting on a person's mind, as we seen in our daily experience. When one person meets another, sup-

pose a conversation take place between them, whom we will call A and B. A says, well Mr. B I think you are looking forty years old instead of thirty. How is that? There is a change in that person's mental organism which makes him actually appear forty years old for the moment. We are influenced in that way every day. If we call all people sinful they will feel always that they are considered so, and if they are not sinful they will commit sins and be sinful to some degree from this suggestion. But if we say that man is divine, that we are a part of God, as Jesus said, then we rise higher and higher toward our ideal. Then another rule comes in, that the faults of other people ought not to be discussed or mentioned even, and this rule is practically put into force in India. One of the teachings given to us is that every person ought to cultivate four kinds of thoughts; one is friendliness, to consider all living beings as our friends and not our enemies at all. If any person injures us, we must only think in this way, that he is injuring himself, and why should we injure him again in return. When I injure another person I have injured my spiritual nature, and if that person injures me in return he injures my body therefore that system is condemned by our religion and philosophy. The second kind of thought to be kept present in the mind is gladness. That is, to be glad at the happiness or prosperity of other people, that is, never to be jealous. If a person becomes rich,

simply be glad of that. The third thought is compassion. If we see a person or any being in a miserable condition let us have some pity for him, have compassion for him, sympathize with him, but never think he ought to suffer, because it is a just punishment. Of course it is just that he should suffer, but we ought not to send any vibrations except those of sympathy, for that would make our own nature hard and cruel. The fourth thought is indifference. That is a very dubious word. Of course we ought not to be indifferent in a certain way, but we should be indifferent to the faults of other people. Our business ought not to be to find fault with any other person, with regard to that fault we should only say that he has that fault and it would be well if he should improve his fault; but never try to make that fault greater and greater. Be charitable with regard to this, as Jesus was in the case of the woman who was taken in adultery. When we think that a certain person is guilty and that his judgment is left to us, always think that he is to be raised and not lowered. Avoid temptation even in thought. These four rules have always been taught to us; there is no hope of progress even until these four thoughts become permanent in our minds. This state is a mental state, but when we come into contact with other people we have to act towards them, then something practical comes in; then comes in the moral nature. Morality is not to be practised only

because by the practise of that morality we are to rise higher, but because it is the life of the soul, the very essence of the soul. There may be some results to be derived from that kind of conduct, but that is not the object of the soul. No other life can conflict with it. Truthfulness, kindness, justice and universal love are only the features of the soul's life. There may be other results but from these the person's object in life is seen. A man may plant trees in an orchard, and at the same time other things, as grass etc, but his real object is not grass or other things, but fruit. In the same manner there may by many occult powers which will come from the observance of all these rules, but that is not the object of the soul, and if this is made the object of the soul it is degraded to a certain extent. This will be the same thing as saying, "be good for the sake of goodness," and no other purpose with no idea of getting any other fruit or having my reward. When we want to have a reward we really sell our soul power, and any possible price is very little in consideration or in comparison with the nature of the soul. Nothing can be considered but the power of the soul, the potencies which are these. These are the moral rules. I could at the same time tell you many things as to the results actually derived from the practise of the moral rules, but any one who practises them will find out that these results are facts, but when they are practised only for the purpose of gain of some-



kind there is no real value in them to the soul. The occult powers may be possessed, but if they are not used in the right way it is a loss rather than a gain. If the object is only living the soul life the occult powers may come out, and there is real gain and not loss of anything. Take universal love and the result derived from the practise of this is freedom from danger of any kind. A person who practises universal love to the highest extent in all the relations of life has no fear of injury from any source; but we generally do not practise these things and therefore how can we expect to derive real benefit from them? Nothing can injure such a person except on account of the *Karma* engendered in the past life which is not yet worked out. The actual result you will see in India. It has been said, "He shall give his angels charge over thee," but human beings are higher than angels. I have said in my other classes concerning the Hindu monks that when a person practises universal love his very being becomes saturated with the vibrations of love, and the wild animals, which prey upon each other because they have no sympathy, in the case of these monks the vibrations subdue the animal nature and the monks can sleep in the jungle among the wild beasts with perfect safety. I would say that India is not one country but a collection of many nationalities, and the Hindus are only one of these and therefore the whole of India is not Hindu India, but India is a combination of Hindus, Jains,

Mohammedans, Christians, Jews, Parsees, Turks and remnants of the aboriginal tribes or Hillmen. The Population is about three hundred millions. The statistics as they have been presented show that about twenty thousand persons were in a certain year killed by wild beasts, including of course serpents and scorpions. This twenty thousand when compared to the whole population of India is not so very large. Even in the United States most of the crimes which are committed can be traced to drink, and when we compare that state with the state of India the deaths from wild animals are nothing in comparison to the other statement, and when we also consider the fact that these people who are killed are not always Hindus, and that all of them are not of the highest class in morality, who always practise universal love, we can see that there is really nothing in this to prove that universal love causes the country to be overrun with animals. It is probable that there is not a single instance in a community of Jains in which a person is known to have been devoured by any wild beast. No monk has up to this time been killed in this way. All these facts would prove that this practise of universal love tends to curb the wild nature of animals. We have said that these beasts have a ferocious nature. There is no real necessity for a ferocious nature in animals but there must be some reason for its existence. It is a result of some kind of feeling on the part of

human beings. Where there is always a desire of killing there is always a great deal of passion and if the human being on account of his inventive genius has discovered many things for the purpose of destroying them, yet he does not diminish the number of these animals; they must be destroyed every year. There are many other things which destroy human life, and the means taken to destroy them simply increase them, because it is not the right means. Evil is not to be averted by another evil, but by good. Even in great wars, where people have fought with one another a compromise has been brought about by word of mouth and in no other way I think that this was also said by one of your presidents in his message (Lincoln). Therefore we always prefer the mode of forgiveness and not of offending in return. There is another reason why such a report as this, that I have quoted comes to this country, of so many human beings having been killed. It is this, that when a person dies the dead body is taken to the coroner's and a certificate must accompany it, and if such a certificate is not produced inquiry will be made, which would take so much time and trouble for the relatives of the person, that sometimes poor people who have never been under treatment of any doctor, and are compelled to produce this certificate, when they are asked from what cause the person died, will say that he died of snake-bite, in which case of course no physician

could have been called. I myself have observed such instances. In that way the matter is disposed of at once. So it will be seen that such statistics cannot be relied on. We may find in the reports of the missionaries that 72,000 people are waiting for baptism in India, and there are not hands enough to baptize them. This was asked me, and I said that I myself had not seen the people who were waiting for this, but there is no difficulty in baptizing them; the Americans are a very inventive people, and they can easily send over a few fire-engines to India to solve the difficulty. Thus there are many reports in this country about India of which we in India have never heard. We say, then that though we can derive many results, obtain many occult powers by the practise of these moral acts, that is not the object of the moral acts. They are to be practised for their own sake. Finally comes in the spiritual nature of the soul. What is, really speaking the the spiritual nature of the soul? It may be said to have a center but no circumference, and therefore cannot be described by any words; it can only be experienced by all of us, if we are living on that plane; but we can sometimes describe it by simile. The idea of the soul is always explained by the circle. Its having no circumference means simply that there is a unit, a real soul, but it cannot be located. All oriental nations are fond of using similes, and in fact, in the ancient times there was no other way of explaining

these things. The Egyptians often used the figure of a cat for representing the moon, and some mythologists have said that there was a cat behind the moon in their conception; but that was not the idea. The idea was that the cat can see in the night, and the moon is the source from which we obtain light at night. The idea of spirit and matter coming into conjunction has been represented by a cross. That does not mean that matter is always in a perpendicular and spirit in a horizontal position, but only that this figure expresses the idea. So we have hundreds and thousands, of symbols which may not be described by any words. The description which would be given of different things is just according to the idea that we derive through experience of our senses. As the soul itself is not a thing which can be perceived by the senses, no material description could be used for it. We say that the soul passes into *Nirvana*, but we express this idea in sentences, so that we may have at least some idea of the condition which is called *Nirvana* though it cannot be described in language. We say that that condition is infinite existence, infinite knowledge, infinite bliss, and we must bear in mind that infinite conditions mean not material sense-conditions having no end. There cannot be two infinities, there cannot be two things existing at the same time at all points, if we regard merely space; but infinite power does not require space, it is not a material thing. Material power may

require a material medium and infinite material power must require an infinite medium; therefore there could not be two such material infinite powers existing. But knowledge means the power of knowing something, and is not material; therefore that idea of the impossibility of the existence of two infinite things is really speaking a false idea because the reasoning itself is fallacious. It is a reasoning in which there is no middle term, because the word infinite would be used in the major and minor premises in two different senses. We have therefore to discuss the physical condition, mental, moral and spiritual conditions of the soul, and the laws which are to be derived for the purpose of advancing the life of the soul must be based on the facts which are experienced on all these planes, and must also be based on the true ideas of the relation of the human being with other beings. Although in a theoretical sense we may divide the planes of life into different divisions, the lowest kind being the monad, along all the other planes, the vegetable, animal, etc., till we come to the highest plane, that of human life, which we also divide into different planes, still we know that our own life is related to all other life, and certainly we must observe the facts with regard to all this other life. Physical life we can know by actual observation, in other forms of life, or in the human body itself. How is it maintained? Let us observe in the case of the tree. It lives by gathering to itself

other particles of matter which it assimilates. At the same time, while it assimilates all these it destroys the life of these particles. If these particles lived their own life always independently of the life of the tree, there could be no growth. Suppose in the human body so many living beings, each living its own life the human being cannot live. The physical elements must be assimilated. So in the physical life there is no possibility of existence without destruction of other life, at the same time we know that to a certain extent there is always gathering of more and more particles every moment, but finally the organism collects less and less and at last it disintegrates and the life force departs from it and we call this death. This is the ordinary idea of the physical life, and most of us who have not studied occult sciences think that there is no life beyond this, and that all rules must be based only on facts observed in this life and that advancement in this life is the object to be gained. To a certain extent the destruction of the physical life is the death of the soul, for it is a change in the condition of the soul; the relation is broken. In order to live the highest kind of life there ought to be the greatest amount of spiritual life, and this killing of other beings ought to be carried only to that extent necessary to support the body and not for any other purpose. No act therefore ought to be done which would necessarily lead to killing other beings.

A beautiful illustration is given in the Jain philosophy. There was a gentleman who was a great merchant, and for smuggling certain articles into his store was punished with a certain time of imprisonment. The next day his son was injured by another person who was also sentenced to the same time of imprisonment and was put into the same cell in the penitentiary and on account of the peculiar laws of the city in which they lived both of them were put in the stocks, wooden instruments in which they cannot move. Sometimes they would be put into chains, and then also one cannot move without the concurrence of the other. For some purpose the one person, whom we call A. wished to go out of the cell, and said to the other, whom we will call B "I wish to go out." B replied, "You gave me none of the food which was brought to you." A said, "Next time I will do so," and the next day when the food was brought he gave him a portion of it, and continued to do so every day. B. of course was obliged to stay in the prison one day longer than A. as he was imprisoned on the day after A. When A. was released he did not send for the food again for B. because there would be no necessity for sending it in the same manner. We say of the body and the soul that they are put together as these men were chained together, and as the soul requires the body to serve its purpose, food is necessary to sustain the body in accomplishing this purpose; but if it is taken



for another purpose there is a departure from the right reason, and instead of assisting the soul it injures the soul. We are to live just as A. gave the food, for a certain purpose so that he might leave his cell; in the same way the body cannot do anything unless it has food prepared for it; not that the food itself will be changed into some spiritual substance, but it is always to be used for a certain purpose. The soul lives its own life, not for the purpose of the body, but the body lives for the purpose of the soul, and every opportunity which the body affords to the soul for thinking on higher matters must be taken advantage of; but if we believe that the soul is to be controlled by the body the soul misses its powers in this way. This is the way in which we understand the relation of the soul and the body.

---

## K A R M A .

---

In the logical development of the Hindu philosophical systems, the doctrine of Karma occupies a conspicuous place. The earliest effusions of the Aryan people, when we first find them settling on the bank of the Indus, are prayers to nature-gods, invoking them to protect themselves and their flocks and to help them in conquering their enemies. Their ceremonial consisted of offerings of oblations to the names of deceased ancestors, sacrifices to the powers of nature and praises of the benign forces which they had personified. This the later Hindus called the Karma-marga, the path of works in contradistinction to the Gnana-marga the path of knowledge. The Upanishads and the Bhagavad-gita treat of Karma in the above sense and the sense of duty. The *Dharma-shastra* prescribe many ceremonials and duties under the head Karma. The Vedanta sharply distinguishes the Karma-marga from the Gnana-marga.

One of the truths of Philology, which strikes us more than others, is that a world continually develops in ideas with the advance of culture and civilization. The Greek philosopher Heraclitus uses the word, "Logos" in the sense of the reason of the world. His analysis of the world ultimately leads him to the principle of Becoming, Change. In this view, this change is accomplished in accordance with definite relations, and in a succession that remains always the same. This rhythm of events he calls by various names. Destiny, Order, Reason (Logos) is his First Principle. These predicates, in which physical, ethical and logical order in the world appear as still identified,—prove only the undeveloped state of thought which does not yet know how to separate the different motives. The Stoics had a little different view of the Logos. According to them the entire universe formed a single, unitary, living, connected whole, and that all particular things were the determinate forms assumed by a divine primitive power which was in a state of eternal activity. In their view, the deity, as the actively productive and formative power, is a kind of Logos, also the rational part of souls is a co-substantial emanation from the divine Logos. The Christian idea of Logos is largely influenced by the Stoic doctrine, only—there are added to it the appeal to and supremacy of authority. Right knowledge was therefore, not possible except—through

divine revelation All knowledge is, as Numenius said, the kindling of the small light from the great light which illumines the world Later Logos gets entirely personified Origen teaches that God begets the eternal Son, the Logos, as the sum-total of his world-thoughts, and through him the realm of free spirits, which, limited within itself, surrounds the deity as an ever-living garment

I have given the above illustration simply for confirming the idea that a word, with advancing civilization developes in meaning I need not go into the discussion of the various meanings that were attached to Karma at different periods of its history My present purpose is only to present to the readers a complete view of the subject of Karma as the Jains have understood it What is Karma? Before answering this question, it will be necessary to know what the philosophical view of the Jains is in regard to the Cosmos. They teach that the total reality known as the Cosmos had no beginning and will have no end More corretly speaking, the Cosmos did not come out of nothing and will never be annihilated The substance, in the abstract sesnse, of the Cosmos is permanent, its activities are changing every moment If Reality means the highest generalized idea we can form of whatever we come to know, it is the Being, Esse. It being the most abstract idea, it is not divisible We may

say it is one, without a second. Truly speaking, numbering does not apply to abstraction. If, however, reality means concrete substances having essentially different activities, different not only in degree but in kind, then we have two grand divisions of the Universe, the animate world and the inanimate world. In the Jain view, the inanimate world consists of matter, two kinds of ether, known as *Dharmastikaya* and *Adharmastikaya*, and space. The animate world consists of innumerable kinds of living beings, each being a centre of complex forces. Time may be figuratively called a substance, really meaning a generalized mode of thought in regard to the activities of beings and things.

The universe is not merely a congeries of the above mentioned substances, heaped together and set in activity by an extra cosmic creator, but is a system by itself, governed by laws inherent in its very constitution. Law is not to be understood in the sense of a rule of action prescribed by authority, but as a proposition which expresses the constant or regular order or certain phenomena, or constant mode of action of things and beings. It is not a command but a formula to which things or beings conform precisely and without exception, of course, under definite circumstances and surroundings. Jainism, therefore, is not a theistic system in the sense of the belief of the existence of a god as the

Creator and Ruler of the universe. And still, the highest being, in the Jain view, is a person and not characterless, quality-less Being like Brahma of the Vedanta.

Every living being, from the minutest to the highest embodied one, is the centre of innumerable activities. In any particular being, these activities determine the stage of its evolution. It has its biological or vital activities—those of drawing the necessary nutritive elements, assimilating them, also of growth and decay and feeling in a way the influences of the forces of nature. Under certain circumstances and relationships, certain influences act upon it in an uncongenial way; and still, in course of time, it develops a wonderful adaptability.

---

## THE SCIENCE OF EATING.

---

This science may be treated not only from the standpoint of the western scientists, but also from that of the Hindus. The scientists and chemists have analyzed in so many ways the different articles of diet, and have divided them into the two classes of nitrogenous and non-nitrogenous foods, saying that the one is important for the formation of the tissues, bones, blood, etc., and the other kind is necessary for the formation of other elements. They give the percentage of different elements in all the different articles of diet, and recommend some kinds and not others on the basis. While they analyze the food into physical elements, they do not consider the moral and spiritual elements. Our theory divides food into three kinds, going a step further, as it divides matter into three kinds, the first having the quality of passivity, the second of activity and the third of grossness. So food is divided into three classes, the first giving quietness, the second activity or motion or heat, and the third

that class of food which gives the quality of slothfulness or absence of motion, of the property of giving heat, or quietness even. These three properties of matter, each are found on the physical plane to have the qualities corresponding to those on the mental and moral planes. In this way we would not advocate some kinds of foods which are accepted as good by the chemists, and here the the great distinction comes in which the Hindus make in regard to food. In the matter of animal and vegetable food they accept the one and reject the other. The reason for this is different from the reasons given by the chemists. We admit that we have the same elements in animal food as in vegetable, but there are certain injurious properties in the animal food which do not exist in the vegetable. Take the first property of matter, quietness, purity, calmness, which is to be found in all those very substantial and nutritious, in wheat and other nitrogenous substances, in milk, in butter even to a certain extent. These are used for the purpose of forming tissues, muscles, etc. There are other substances belonging to the second class which create heat in the body and these are the substances in which carbon is predominant. All fatty substance, all starchy substances are of the second class. In the human system these elements are necessary and therefore the first and second kinds of food are very important. The third kind gives sluggishness to the human



body, and to this class belong the foods which we avoid. They clog the system. These are such foods as cheese, all earthy foods, and other substances in which there is difficulty of digestion. We do not stop there, but examine the nature of the animal diet and the vegetable diet. The very elements which are found in the vegetable diet are also found in the animal diet, but there are certain other reasons why we reject the latter. We first say that man was never intended to be a carnivorous animal. The scriptures are in favor of a vegetarian diet and not of the animal diet. There is a passage in Genesis which says that the God said, "I have given you every herb, etc., for your meat" Later on account of the fall of man as it is understood, of course by all advocates of that theory, the people became flesh eaters and were carnivorous, but the original idea of holy persons was that the food proper for man was the vegetable diet. In other books of the Bible you will find passages confirming this theory. In the book of Daniel you will find such a passage. This proves that the earliest theory in the Bible history was of the vegetable diet. There are of course other reasons for following this rule besides the fact that sacred history confirms it. There are many people who do not believe in these books, and they think only of scientific facts. They think that muscular strength and endurance depend on animal diet, but science and

facts are both against this view. In regard to muscular strength, in India we have all kinds of people, English and Hindus and in both endurance and strength the Hindus are far superior to the English people. In all parts of the world it has been known that the Hindus are more able to endure the struggles of war than the English. They say that in colder climates the carbons and fatty substances necessary to the human body can only be supplied by meat, but vegetables and all starchy substances contain more carbon than flesh. Another reason is given, that in colder climates vegetables do not grow, but in this age of civilization when transportation is so easy and one kind of food can be carried in so short a time from one country to another, these arguments are of no avail. If we compare different parts of the world where people use different kinds of food we shall find that this theory is controverted, for the people in Africa, living very near the Equator, are cannibals, while the Hindus who live in the Himalayas are still vegetarians. And we find proof of the comparative strength of the Hindus who live side by side with the English who are meat-eaters, that the travellers who go to Thibet, among the mountains where horses cannot travel, employ carriers who take the travellers on their shoulders and cross the mountain in this way. It is the Hindus who live on pulse and other herbs who are able to carry the

meat-eating, pork-eating Englishman over the mountains which he cannot climb by himself. This is so far as physical strength is concerned. But there is not only the physical condition of the body that is to be taken into consideration, there are intellectual and moral reasons which are of more importance. Those who partake of animal food are not superior in this respect to those who live on vegetables. Animal food must create animal nature. It is necessary not to increase the animal nature by taking in animal food, but to make the mental and moral natures command the physical. The animal whose flesh we eat lived on vegetables, and when the animal character and propensities are given to the vegetable it is not well for the human being to take that kind of food, when these qualities have been added to it. A person who lives on animal food only is not able to enter into the studies of the higher sciences, which are very easy in the opinion of the people who live on simple vegetable food. We know by instinct that the vegetable food is best for us, we do not like the smell of raw meat, and it takes a great deal of time to become accustomed to the use of meat. We have to teach the baby to eat; meat; it has naturally no craving for it; so naturally man is not fitted, really speaking, to eat the animal food. It is also a great source of the passionate nature of the human being. We know by practical experiment that when hunters wish to

prepare their dogs for the chase, to do that they confine the diet of hounds to flesh, so that their animal propensities are enhanced. This food would not give more strength to the hounds, but gives them more animal nature, and makes them more eager to kill. If we compare flesh eating people and vegetarians intellectually, the Hindus have evolved a very subtle and deep philosophy, the like of which is not to be found in any other country. In India when a deep philosophical subject is discussed, the masses understand at once without asking a single question, and the street-sweeper understands these questions better than the missionary who is sent to convert him. No reasoning intellectual, intelligent person would stick to habit when he realizes these things; he comes to the conclusion that animal food is not designed for human beings. It certainly becomes a cause of many diseases. Cancer is caused by meat-eating. The hurts of vegetarians are healed sooner than those of flesh-eaters. Small-pox is considered a very dangerous disease in this country, but the people in India have not the slightest fear of this epidemic at all. If a man falls ill of this disease his friends will come to him every day, and do not catch the disease, and they are never afraid of these things. It is only when the temperature goes up to 110 degrees that you will find any epidemic in India, and then cholera is the result. As an experience in daily life, those who eat meat know

that this food demands the intoxicating stimulants of drink, and a necessity arises not only for that kind of food, but for drink also. People who live on simple food never desire these intoxicants. After considering all these things our philosophers have given us the rule that it is not the best plan to eat animal food. There are minor objections to all these rules; one is that all persons cannot live on cereals; but there are other vegetables and fruits, and in the case of fruits almost all of these are in such a condition that they can be digested at once and do not require such work of the stomach, and fruit would be one of the best foods as it has the first quality of matter passivity, purity and quietness. These qualities are to be found to a large extent in almost all fruits and substantial foods like wheat. The sacred book of the Hindus, the Bhagavad-Ghita, which is considered very sacred, gives certain rules with regard to these matters of diet, and these different qualities of food. It says in describing the foods which belong to the first class, "Such foods give us more vitality, more health, more prosperity, and we love others more from partaking of such foods. The second kind of food that which gives activity, which creates desires, passions, motions, mental feelings, these foods are those in which are to be found the properties of sour or, of saltish, or hot, or bitter. These are the foods of the second kind, and they give rise to all the different emotional natures of

human beings The third kind of food gives us grossness, sluggishness, slothfulness, is that food which is left over a day or over a night, which is changed in its taste, is the refuse, as it were; also that in which there is too much of fat and animal food. All these are considered to be of the third class. The third property of matter, which carries us lower and lower in the gradations of life, we avoid altogether. Even among the vegetables we have certain reasons for objecting to certain kind of vegetables While these rules are not to be found among the Brahmins, the Jains observe them strictly. With us no vegetable is eaten which is grown underground, because it takes its quality from the minerals, without contact from the sunlight, and so it would belong to the third class and of course have the third quality. We do not encourage such food on that account. People may say, "But what can we eat?" But there are so many kinds of fruits, cereals, nuts, etc., there is no necessity for living on one sort of food. Some may say, "What can those persons who live in cold climates where there are no vegetables do?" "If I am placed in a position where I must either starve or commit murder of a human being, what shall I do?" It would be better to starve. We are all quite sure with regard to the immortality of the soul. That it is not the soul which dies; all religions agree on that point, that the soul is not a transient entity If it is going to live for ever why do we care

simply for the body and not for the soul? Eating meat simply to support the body is not a sound basis, and our people would say that the people who live in countries where there are no vegetables and where they are obliged to eat flesh, have no business to live in those countries. Another thing, even in the coldest climates of Ameriea it is possible to import food from California or any other country, and when people simply say that it is impossible for those people to live on any other diet it means simply that they do not wish to live on any other diet. What ground is there for supposing that a human being has the soul of an animal? It is not a question of soul at all in the selection of food. When a human being is killed, the soul is not killed; the soul is an entity which is immortal, and it is not dead, but only living in some other body. We have only destroyed the relation which has existed between soul and the body. It is higher in the human being than in the animal, but on a lower in the vegetable than in the animal. It is better, since we must destroy some life in order to live, that the life should be destroyed on the lower plane, than on the higher. The same arguments just mentioned might be applied to killing human beings, but we do not all become cannibals on account of the fact that the soul is not destroyed by the death of the body. The question of existence or non-existence of the soul has no bearing, at all, on this

question if we cannot give life, what right have we to destroy it? Suppose the vegetable food is not better than the animal; man has not, therefore, a right to crush down the other beings which inhabit the universe. Another argument is that if the animals allowed to increase, they will become injurious, through their numbers. We know there will not be super-abundance among people who do not make a business of raising cattle for the purpose of killing them. In our country, where there is no such a thing as cattle-farming for the purpose of killing them but only for the purpose of giving milk, there has never been a super-abundance of animals. Those who have lived mostly on meat, do not understand cooking vegetables. The cooking in this country is equivalent to boiling, and boiling, is not cooking, that is, the food should be cooked to such a degree that it is palatable, nutritious and not injurious. Take, for instance, rice. When that is cooked in the ordinary American fashion, it is cooked till it is paste, which might be very good to paste paper on a wall, but is not good to eat.

We know that the growth of nature is slow of process, and must take its natural time, and if you cook any articles too quickly, it will be spoiled. Everything is done in haste in this country. They say that they have no time. How do they utilize the time which is saved? For the public good? But



you must make home and yourself happy first, and that is to be done by right management and right regulations in family life, and right preparation of the food; and here you will find a great difference between the people of this country, and the people of my country. The first education given to a girl in my country is in cooking, but in this country, ladies think it beneath their dignity; therefore, the ordinary diet in this country is only beef, potatoes, coffee, bread, etc., and everything is stereotyped. A progressive nation like America ought surely to study modes of cooking. So many inventions are made every day, it ought not to be a difficult thing to learn to cook. But in the rush and push and hurry of living, care for the body is left in the hands of the physician, the care of the soul is left in the hands of the ministers, and the care of the daily life in the hands of the servants. The right first to be exercised is that of self-government. When one can do that, he can rule other people and teach them to rule themselves. In our schools for girls, cooking is one of the branches. The school-mistress every day teaches all the different modes of cooking rice, and of making bread and other articles of food, so that at the age of ten or twelve, all the girls know how to cook anything, so that after graduating, the girls are not required to learn anything else, so far as cooking is concerned. From the earliest age, the girl assists

her mother and the mother asks her first to pick the pebbles from the rice, wash the vegetables, and so on, and she assists her mother in other duties of the household as she grows older. But when everything is left to the servants, how is it possible to lead a healthy life? We must first understand the object of life, the raising of humanity on all three planes of being. But how is this to be done? Unless all the members are raised, if the good of individuals is not advanced the good of the whole society cannot be advanced.

With regard to drink, I should say that until the advent of British rule, the Hindus did not know what tea was. I, myself did not taste tea before I was twenty years old, and even in this day, in our small towns and villages, the people never use it. They consider it a kind of medicine, and an acquired taste like this is not a natural taste. The very nature of tea is stimulating, and the natural result is nervousness; people who drink much tea, do not know how to keep still. Our simple drink in India is water, and that, also, is not mixed with anything. The Germans sometimes think water is not enough, and so they drink beer, but that is not allowed in our communities, and if a person even touches wine he takes a bath. If you understand the science of the aura which comes out from the human body, you will understand the reason for taking a bath.

Taking wine means to us stimulating certain feelings in the body, and <sup>so</sup> that nature can be gotten rid of by the use of water. When a person is very angry the religious teacher asks him to take a bath at once and he is pacified in this way. Of course, such things are not to be found every day, because with the Hindus, there is no such things as the weekly bath; they take the bath early in the morning, generally. Their idea of life and their science being different, thier remedies for various evils are also different. With regard to the time of eating, I may say that in our city, we have only two meals, but in the country where people have to work so much harder, there must be three meals. but there must be a certain interval and no eating between meals. Anything taken between meals, stops the process of digestion. One great rule is, do not take the second meal until the first is digested. It takes about three hours to digest one meal, and, therefore, the two meals should be at least four hours apart. With the Jain communities, there are many rules not observed by other people. One is not to take any food after sunset, because of the beneficial influence of the sunlight, which is with drawn, of course, at the time. There are other reasons, based on occult science, for not taking food after sunset, and there are innumerable finer and deeper and unknown forces present in nature everywhere, that

unless we study all of them from all standpoints, can never be fully understood by us. The reasons of our little acts, which we perform every day, are also occult in their meaning, but which we cannot fully understand unless we have studied deeply into these sciences, and have lived the life peculiar to the *Yogis*; but those who pursue those studies, can know many things which are mystical to ordinary people.

---

## ASTRAL VISION

---

This evening our subject includes many minor topics. It also includes something in connection with Astral force itself, the material or matter called Astral life and the different modes in which it is manifested to us. The most important and patent way in which this life is manifested to the human being is generally known as clairvoyance. We see many things, under peculiar circumstances, and many have peculiar experiences in this line. Sometimes it takes the form of many beautiful rays of light, of symbolical scenes, and the play of lights pure white and brilliant. We are at a loss why one should be able to see these different manifestations and others cannot. It means that they have not heretofore developed this power, but it does not mean that they are not able, that they do not have the ability to develop the power to do so.

Persons devoid of scientific knowledge of these things are at a loss to understand why they should take place and why other people in all respects ap-

parently similar, should not experience the same things. Unless we have a scientific understanding of these things it is difficult to give a satisfactory explanation that will not confuse us, or give us an erroneous idea as to their cause and effect

Let us take ordinary clairvoyance or clairvoyance as it is generally known and practised. Of course we know there are many different kinds of clairvoyance, and that most of them mix up, or confuse one thing with another. We will divide that subject under two heads, induced or artificial clairvoyance, and natural clairvoyance. While the induced clairvoyance is produced artificially, of course, unless there is the seed of a certain force, nothing can be done, and a person altogether ignorant, having no ethical or moral idea, at the same time having no seed of that force in him, cannot see clairvoyantly. Why it is so, and why the ethical lessons would help such a person, I will speak later on.

In induced clairvoyance certain conditions are produced artificially by the operator, and the subtle body manifests activity. Under this induced activity many things may be seen. In the previous lectures I have explained the constitution of the subtle body, and it is clear to us that when the physical body stops its work, and ceases manifesting through its

physical faculties, the subtle body finds ample opportunity to show its activities. When the subtle body is able to manifest these finer activities, it senses many etherial vibrations not grasped by the physical body. This is the real secret of clairvoyance.

In induced clairvoyance, the person is asked not to exercise his sense-consciousness. The vibrations of the external cannot make an impression on the physical organs where the sense-consciousness is not exercised. but at the same time it is not a condition employing perfect or deep sleep. Perfect or deep sleep means the subtle body, as well as the physical, must cease working. If it were only the physical body that stopped its work, it would not be deep sleep, in so much as the subtle body and all its faculties are in a state of activity; and there is the same consciousness but it has not physical faculties, which are asleep, to manifest through. It has not to spend its energies on the many exterior things, which is usually the outcome of physical manifestation. Without that extra spending of force, the vibrations are carried directly from the external world to the subtle body. In the state of ordinary waking consciousness those very vibrations are interpreted through sensations produced on the physical organs of sense, and therefore very little is left to be done by the subtle organs. Not only that

but the subtle body and all its capacities are all constituted in such a manner that they are compelled to supply the physical body and the organs of sense with vital force, and when these physical organs are in use, there are many of those finer vibrations which escape the notice of the finer, more subtle organs. This is the reason why so many things pass about us and are not recognized.

There are worlds within worlds. There are many, many physical and subtle activities; and we sense and catch only the grosser vibrations in the ordinary waking state of consciousness. It does not mean the finer vibrations do not come to us. They go on as usual, and will go on for ever, but you are not in a condition to sense them. In induced clairvoyance, hypnotism, magnetism, etc., the physical activities are artificially stopped and therefore it offers a better opportunity to the subtle organs for expression. In this condition when the subject hears something, or gets certain messages, and interprets them in his own way, it is not always something new which comes to him or her. It may be new, or it may not be new.

For instance if the condition is higher, if the development is higher, then the unfoldment of the soul's faculties being greater and on a higher level, through those faculties, the soul can see many things. Sometimes a bond of sympathy is esta-



blished between the subject and the operator. In this case nothing is done but the sensing of operations going on between them. It is a sort of telepathy which is going on between the subject and the operator. Now we generally think the right kind of operations are only those which we perform consciously, and therefore that if the operator does not think actively on a subject he is not thinking at all. There are dynamic and static vibrations. If they are not active, dynamic forces they are static, and they have not been called forth. Under these circumstances we are not conscious of those vibrations which have been created under other circumstances. We sometimes think because we do not bring all our mind's thought to bear on a subject, that it is not in our mind at all. There we make a great mistake. The fact is that in the past as well as in the present, there are many static forces in our mind which we are not aware are there. A person may pass through the street and not be aware that he is nothing at all that is going on about him. In fact he is not conscious that he has seen them, that they have been received and stored away as it were. They have not gone deep enough to effect his waking consciousness, the active state of the mind.

Vibrations coming from the external world will impinge on the mind stuff in different ways. Suppose the soul consciousness itself is in the centre. When

the vibrations are very strong they go on and pass through all the layers of different grades of matter and substance until they reach the very substance which we call the sheath or understanding. It is only when they reach through the physical body, the sheath of vitality, of thought and understanding, that you form a rational idea and come to certain conclusions, and feel that you know certain things. Many vibrations do not reach all the states. They do not reach the finer substance in the centre, and no thought is generated, and you have no understanding, you have arrived at no decision. The result is certain forces or impressions are made on only intermediate states of the external forces and on the external body. As they have not reached the sheath of understanding you do not know what those forms and their meaning are. When a person is artificially put into a certain condition, and the physical activities are stopped and do not receive any impression at all, on the external body, a free opportunity is given for those vibrations to come into activity, and they will proceed further and go deeper and deeper, until they reach the thought plane. Then those thought forms will be expressed in an intelligent way. This is only so far as those vibrations have been created in previous conditions. While this is the case in many of the experiments, there is also another thing which actually happens. That we must also study

In other cases it is not the previous thought forces or impressions that are sensed by the subject as something which is new, and that is this way; when a person is operated on by a hypnotist or mesmerist, the physical vibrations make no impressions on the physical substance and the other substances, the etherial forces are free to act. Those substances of the thought have a better opportunity to work, and it sends forth its energies in different directions. That thought substance has the power of seeing things, just as our eyes, our physical eyes, have the power to see things. If the mind is closed we cannot see internally. That mind must be as it were, open if it is to see, just as we must open our eyes if we expect to see.

In this condition of induced clairvoyance, a person is able to see many things. In both conditions, whether it is induced, or whether it is only the force that produced it before, or when new things are seen, and even in natural clairvoyance which is the result of development, in both states, there is a kind of danger which is of a peculiar form. Many times what is seen is of an inverted nature. It may be only disturbed, and indistinct. How is it that people see things altogether, or partially inverted? How is it when they are asked to read something inclosed in an envelope, instead of read-

ing it in a proper way, they read it in an inverse way? We must find out the reason for this, and if the defect can be cured, how it is to be accomplished

Whatever we see is through a medium, and if that medium is cloudy, then the reflection made by the medium is also cloudy. Supposing there is a mirror or looking glass placed in a certain position, and near by is an object, which is globular or spherical. It is a perfect sphere. If the surface of the looking glass is very clear, and there are no flaws on the surface of it, if it is perfectly pure, like a crystal is pure, and the rays of light strike the surface in a certain direction, then the reflection will be clear, in an angle which will be equal to the angle formed by the rays as they strike the surface of the spherical object. If a reflection is made on the glass, it will be again reflected at the same angle which the rays as they left the object formed when they struck the glass. If the surface of the looking glass is rugged, rough, or there is something in the nature of a flaw, then that reflection will be blurred altogether. If it is excessively rough, then the reflection will be very much blurred, very indistinct indeed.

Where there is an imperfect reflection, the fault lies with the medium from which it is reflected,

not in what it is reflected from. So also in the mental substance on which reflections are made of external substances, the reflections will not be clear unless the mental substance is clear. When a person sees something in an inverted way, it means there is something wrong, there is some trouble, the mind stuff is not clear. What is this? If we can remove those reflections in the mind stuff, the astral vision can be made clear.

Now if we are to have true clairvoyance, this mind stuff must be made clear. There ought to be no impurities. If there are any it explains the cause of this perverted figure which is seen. Let us apply the law to the ordinary state of a man's condition in the world. Suppose a person is asked to judge of anything, we will say an act. Something is proposed to a man. He is told to do it; that it is a good thing. If he has a pure mind he will be able to judge rightly. If some other force is working on his mind, if that mind is not clear, and free from impurity, his judgment will also be of a disturbed character. If greed is working on him, he will judge it as to whether it will bring him any money. All reflections coming out from a mind which is tainted by greed, will be of that character.

If a person's mind is controlled by forces of revenge and jealousy, they will think it is useless, that it does no good to themselves, to exercise love,

and sympathy, and that if they show love and sympathy to others it will work no good result for themselves. The thought will not be reflected in love but in hate. It is not the fault of love, but the fault lies in the mind which reflects the perverted idea. It gives out a disturbed reflection.

There are also several impurities which are of a manifold character. It may be the result of a physically diseased condition of the mind. I told you in a previous lecture the mind is made of activity, stability and grossness. If one of these elements predominate it will color the character of the mind. If a person is very gross, the mental condition will be very gross and that mind will reflect only gross figures. It will not give any fresh, or any new light to such a person. Now this is only so far as the physical cause is concerned.

There are mental causes which are lust, jealousy passion, anger, deceitfulness, and all these forces working within the mind disturb the mind, and it will always give out disturbed reflections. Such disturbed minds cannot reflect the truth.

Other vibrations will also be of a defective character. If the disturbance can be removed, suppressed, or destroyed, if the anger, jealousy, passion and lust, can be annihilated, then pure impressions can come from the mind. People do

not consider these things. They think they will use a mechanical method altogether, and that it can be done without the aid of mental purity. It is not possible. They must purify the mind or the interpretations will always be defective, and no truth can be obtained under those conditions. In the Eastern countries, they always lay great stress on the fact that a person cannot become clairvoyant unless he has a pure nature.

You have often heard of mediumistic or psychic persons reading figures or the numbers of pages in an inverted way. If I should ask such a clairvoyant to tell me the number of a certain page in a closed book, they will give it to me but the letters will be inverted. If it is, for instance, 159, they will say it is 951, If I should ask them for initials in an envelope, and those letters are G. O. B., they will read them to me as B. O. G. That only shows mental perversion. Perfect purity of the mind is necessary if one would see clearly.

Now we come to another point. It is not only the things of the present we see, but we see things of the past, and of the future. How does that come about? Suppose a force is set in motion. We are to do something with the aid of that force. That force as it is set into motion creates an activity in the etherial world, and it will produce a result that will bear a relation or correspondence to the motion

which is the cause of that result. Suppose for instance one man strikes another man. An individual sees the blow, but does not see any further. He sees only the result, the blow. Now that result was the result of a quarrel or of something which was of such a nature as to produce a blow, and the result of that blow is that the one struck has been knocked down. How do we see the past ?

Suppose there is only the blood which the blow caused to flow to be seen, the clairvoyant can see the blow, but it had already passed away, it could not be seen as though it had not already taken place. In this way he has seen the cause. As soon as the cause is set in motion, as soon as it is potential so far as the result is concerned, it does not cease to be a cause. As soon as the cause is set in motion it is not annihilated. A cause can never be destroyed.

We will take for example this piece of paper. The cause of this paper was not paper. Formerly all these little particles which go to make this paper were in many different conditions. Some of them were in one condition, and other particles were in other conditions. Different causes were brought to bear upon them and all these varied little particles became a piece of paper, such as we can see with our physical eyes. The combination of the original molecules, appears to us in a symmetrical form, as a



piece of paper. At the same time the forces which kept apart all these different particles, or molecules of the paper, are changed, and bring closer the different particles. The paper is but a changed state of all the different factors which were effectual in bringing all those factors into the form of paper. The cause is not destroyed.

We will apply the same illustration to the point mentioned heretofore, in knocking down the man. The cause is not destroyed. If we know the present condition, or the link between cause and effect, and the forces working, we can then see the cause. So by seeing the result, also the different intermediate conditions, we can tell what the cause was. We can acquire this in an intellectual way, and it is only a mental process.

In clairvoyance they see all the things at one time, but time and distance are annihilated, and in this way they see the past. Not only that but all causes leave their impressions, in the astral life, in the etherial matter which pervades the whole universe. A psychic person can see those impressions, can sense them as vibrations, and interpret them, and know the particular history of any subject or thing. In the same way we can know the future because it is the result of the present causes. If we see those causes, and the direction of those vibrations, we can tell what the result will be.

In clear clairvoyance the past, present, and future are clearly separated. Suppose there are three stages of an act. What you first see is one form. In five minutes it has another form; and in five more minutes it has still another form. In the ordinary waking state we see the first form. It is destroyed and we see another form, and we see this take on another form. In the clairvoyant state you will see those three forms at once, not all jumbled together, as we sometimes see things jumbled together in mystical signs, but they will be together in an orderly way. You will be able to get a clear idea of their relation to one another. You will be able to distinguish clearly between the past, present, and future.

If they cannot be seen in order, but are all jumbled together, it shows the mind is not clear, and has not acquired the pure faculty or power of clairvoyance. It was in this way that development was made in ancient days, in India by the great masters and sages. Progress in the sciences was made in the same way. They beheld and studied the human body internally and externally. It was not found necessary to perform anatomical experiments in those days. By concentration and looking within, and looking at the forms which were left in the astral light, they understood the nature of the whole world. Perfect science was the result of

these experiments. It is necessary to again revive the same faculty within us.

The first necessity is the ability to concentrate. What does that mean to us ? It means that the mind stuff should acquire stability. The stable element of the mind must become predominant. Whether you formulate it in philosophical, poetical, or scientific language, you must say the mind must be made stable, that it must be able to concentrate. Not all people can concentrate. If that were so we would know well this; as a matter of fact they do not know. That is evidence that all have not as yet developed the same faculty or ability to concentrate

A great writer has said that there are two conditions necessary for concentration. One is called isolation, and the other distribution. Isolation is to be able to separate your consciousness from external things. Distribution is power to apply those powers so acquired to the good of the whole world. A person with the power of isolation, and the faculty of distribution, only can concentrate. Persons who are controlled by greed, jealousy, and such evil tendencies cannot concentrate. In order that a person may not be influenced by the vibrations of the external world, by the confused thoughts of people, the depraved conditions of things in the world, it is necessary that they acquire independence

from prejudice. He must have independence of thought. His thought must not be controlled by the prejudices, and results of false thinking. One who thinks because he was born in certain circumstance, that he is in duty bound to believe in certain dogmas, cannot concentrate. One must be preeminently free, must acquire independence of thought

Secondly his heart must be completely independent. He must have full liberty. If his heart is controlled by lower emotions, he is then a slave to those emotions. Liberty means perfect freedom. Thirdly his senses must not be controlled by temporal or sensuous enjoyments. He will not cease to enjoy, but his enjoyments will take on a different nature.

There is a little illustration given in the Hindu scriptures. A person in his enjoyments is like unto a fly. One person may be like a fly sitting on a liquid, which is not sweet. He is drowned in it and it is a death in a putrid, repulsive thing which he has settled upon. There is another fly which goes to a sweet liquid, instead of something which is putrid. He enjoys the sweetness of it, but in a short time he, too, is drowned. Another fly settles on a sweet, dry substance, like loaf-sugar. He enjoys it, and then flies away. If a person wishes

to enjoy, he must be like the fly which got his enjoyment from the piece of dry sugar, and when it has been received, go away.

A person wishing to become a great master must not care for sensuous enjoyments. Ultimately we come to the point that a person must not be subject to prejudices. Must not be a slave of passion. He must not allow himself to be engrossed by enjoyments. He may then, after overcoming and acquiring those things needful, all of which are within his ability, become a true adept. Can he not enjoy all pleasures? What are they for? This philosophy teaches us that the person who rules the wealthy, the great person, is greater than the great and wealthy person who is ruled. A person may be in poverty, may not possess a cent's worth of his own property, but he may still rule many people who are great. Real enjoyments do not consist in the possession of riches, wealth, or ordinary worldly power, but in wisdom and knowledge.

The object of human life is not enjoyment. It is wisdom. Why do we do certain things? It is not for enjoyment. In the light of this philosophy pains and pleasure are not for the purpose of accepting the pleasure, and avoiding the pain. It is to accept both for the purpose of receiving fresh strength from them. If they are regarded in that

light, the person liberates his mind from passions, evils and all the lower emotions. If he can do this he can possess all the power the world holds.

There are one or two points I will mention in connection with the subject. Astral vision implies there must be an astral substance. What is it? It is a fluid, a subtle substance which permeates the whole universe. It is in the body and in the entire world. It is the force that gives life and also causes death. It is a phant force as it were. It can be used for good, or evil. It is a great dynamo. It may be used for imparting life, or for the destruction of life. Vicious persons will use it to the injury of other people. Unconsciously persons harboring thoughts of a lower nature will create a commotion in the astral substance, and vibrations so generated will be injurious to all around.

This Force is very contagious and may be taken from one person to another. Persons will feel the influence but not know why they feel such and such inclinations, but because certain people generate certain vibrations in this astral ether, they cause similar vibrations in the astral bodies of other people, and the vibrations so generated react on the physical. Those astral vibrations will be interpreted and they will be acted upon by those people. That is the scientific reason why thoughts of an injurious

or indifferent character should not be harbored by us. Such vibrations should always be positively good. A person will then be a repository of great and good forces.

It has many manifestations, and as it passes forth from our bodies, it manifests itself as human aura. All physical substance, not only that but all different planes of life, from the ordinary physical body to the highest spiritual form, manifests this force, each in its own way.

All hatred, passion, and lust, all our emotions, are but the results and manifestations of this substance. It assumes the form of magnetism. The great adept in magnetism sends it out. If we do not know how it is sent out, it will always produce its result, just as truly as though we did know. If we do know how to send it out, if we desire to do good, it will always benefit all people. In the ordinary experience of hypnotism it goes from us transmitted through the eye, the voice or the fingers. That is the very reason why passes are required to be made in certain diseases, and why they must send forth a piercing glance from the eye. The eye, the voice and the hand, are the great organs through which this magnetism may be sent forth. They all have their laws, and their different aspects.

If we are not sending it out in proper form, if we do not keep the positive equalized with the negative, injury will be the result. These laws were understood in ancient times. They were also understood by the great teachers, like Delsarte, for instance, and other persons who studied and went deeply into physical culture. All the rules which are given in his system have something to do with the great forces working in this human body.

The great magicians, white and black, understood the laws. The white magician understood it and imparted their knowledge to their disciples after they had passed through rigid and strict ordeals, and then only did they give their secrets to their pupils. The black magicians were at all times busy injuring the world. There are now many secret societies used to develop these powers. All the details of the secret societies, are only for the purpose of generating those forces which will send out those teachings to the different parts of the world. The reason why it is practised in unison, is that it becomes more powerful by reason of their concerted effort.

That is why the religious exercises are always carried on together; why songs are sung, and services read. It strengthens and impresses the thought with greater vitality on the minds of the



congregation It is a force of such vast possibilities, for good or evil, so subtle and potent a force, it works night and day, without ceasing, and we must know and understand how and why we use it; otherwise if we do things in connection with this force, we will not be able. through our ignorance, to keep from injuring ourselves as well as others.

---

## ANCIENT INDIA.

---

From the philosophy of the Hindus, Buddhists and Jains, we turn now to the social and political condition of India in ancient times.

Where shall we find the history of ancient civilization of the Hindus when they lived in village communities and social brotherhood in ancient times, centuries before the beginning of the Christian era? Have they any records of that ancient civilization? And why do the Hindus claim their ancient civilization unique in its character and superior to that of any other nation. We shall have to refer to the records of the Hindus if any exist which can claim a high antiquity.

The Egyptians have records on their everlasting monuments of a civilization which goes beyond 3000 years before Christ. Assyrian scholars have claimed an equally remote antiquity for the Shumiro-Accadian civilization of Chaldia which is said to have flourished over a thousand years before

Neniveh and Babylon were founded. The Chinese too have a history which dates from about 2400 years B. C. The Hindus also have their own records. But there is a difference between the records of the Hindus and the records of other nations. The hieroglyphic records of ancient Egyptians yield little information beyond the names of kings and pyramid-builders and accounts of dynasties and wars. The cuneiform inscriptions of Assyria and Babylon tell us much the same story. And even ancient Chinese records shed little light on the gradual progress of human culture and civilization.

Ancient Hindu works are of a different character. They are defective no doubt as accounts of dynasties, of wars, of so-called historical incidents. On the other hand they give us a full, connected and clear account of the advancement of civilization, of the progress of the human mind, such as we shall seek for in vain among the records of any other equally ancient nation. These are the ancient Vedas of the Hindus, Pitakas of the Buddhists and Sutras of the Jains. As to the Vedas Western scholars say that they are the infant outpourings of the simple minded Aryans of ancient times. They also think that they constituted the popular literature of the time. I differ from these views. The Vedic literature is pre-eminently sacerdotal and

in no sense a popular one. Neither in the language nor in the thought of the Rig-Veda can we discover that quality of primitive natural simplicity which so many are fain to see in it. The poetry it contains is of a singularly refined character and artificially elaborated, full of allusions and reticences, of pretensions to mysticism and philosophic thought; and the manner of its expression is such as reminds one more frequently of the phraseology in use among certain small groups of initiated than the poetic language of a large community. Nor is there any ground for supposing that the Veda has taught us everything on the ancient social and religious condition of even Aryan India, or everything there can be accounted for by reference to it. The fact is that in past as in present other religions have existed alongside of Veda, and some claim to have existed even before the Vedas. So that in order to understand the exact condition of India you have to depend not only on the Vedas but on the religious literature of the Jains and the Buddhists also.

We will first take the Vedic literature. The main industry of the people representing that cult was agriculture, as nearly all the hymns are generally prayers to gods, allusions to trade and commerce being very rare. However there are numerous passages which indicate the existence of current money for the purposes of buying and selling.

There are distinct references to voyage by sea and shipwrecks. So far as the food is concerned it appears from the Vedas that these pious worshippers of nature-gods did use animal food. We have frequent allusions in the Vedas to the cooking of cows, buffaloes and bulls. There is mention of slaughter-houses where cows were killed, there are allusions to the sacrifices of horses, bulls and rams, the fermented juice of the soma plant was the intoxicating drink of these people and they go into ecstasy over the virtues and the exhilarating powers of soma. 'O Soma ! there is nothing so bright as thou. When poured out thou welcomest all gods to bestow on them immortality.' The praiseworthy soma has from ancient times been the drink of the gods, he was milked from the hidden recesses of the sky, he was created for Indra and was extolled." "In that realm where there is perennial light, and where the heaven is placed, O Soma, lead me to that deathless and immortal realm. Flow thou for Indra." Such passages as these are to be found throughout the ninth book of the Rig-Veda.

With regard to the social status of the people, they led a very simple life. There were no castes in the modern sense in those times. There were indeed Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas, and Sudras; but there were no iron-bound rules prohibiting one caste from all intercourse with the other. Truly

speaking with Hinduism as based on the Vedas there was no time when there was no such distinction as Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Surdas. The theory of these four castes who were brought forth respectively from the mouth, the arms, the thighs and the feet of Brahma is formulated in the hymn of the Purusha in the the Rig-veda. The truth is that different professions constituted different castes. The Brahmin devoted to prayer and the science of theology was considered to be the highest. As you examine the ritualism of the Brahmins, the Brahmana portion of the Vedas, you find express commands for sacrificing domestic and wild animals. Among these victims there is one which recurs with an ominous frequency viz man. Not only are there traces of human sacrifice preserved in the legends as well as in the symbolism of ritual but this sacrifice is expressly mentioned and formally prescribed. All the great sacrifices as a rule exact one or more human victims and one of them is quite naively called the *narameda* i. e. the sacrifice of man. The texts speak differently in regard to these rights. At one time they represent them as fallen absolutely; but they maintain them as a rule and protest against their abolition; at another time they conceive of them as purely symbolic acts; while at another they simply speak of them as usages in full force. There were however other philosophers living along side of these sacrificers and their doctrines had consider-

able influence with views of the Brahmins. Among the Brahmins themselves there were frequent schisms. These heretic philosophers being under the sway of Brahmin priesthood had to accept, though nominally, the authority of the Vedas. They therefore maintained that although for good worldly rewards, you have to follow the sacrificial system of the Vedas, it does not help at all a man whose sole object is spiritual bliss. Jainism was existing and preaching its doctrines side by side. It had witnessed from times immemorial the various divisions of the Hindu society and loudly proclaimed that one who prided himself as belonging to a high family should invariably enter into lower existence in his next incarnation. Its spiritual philosophy and system of logic was too deep for common people, but it had its own system of ethics for the masses and those who understood this philosophy did join the sect. On several occasions we find from the Jain works that there were religious discussions between the Brahmins and the Jains. The Jain philosophy teaches that such distinctions of caste are sure to arise so long as there is in the human mind the vanity and pride of individual and family greatness. The duty of Jainism which existed side by side with Hinduism was therefore to look down upon this pride and to teach the people the true law of cause and effect. Buddha handled this question differently. In his time the Brahmin priesthood was

supreme. The barriers created by them were unsurmountable. The Jain prophet Mahavira and his 23 predecessors had seen such or similar things in their times. They clearly saw the cause of this—the individual pride which became the cause of a Karma—leading the man to be born under such circumstances that he will be considered as belonging to a lower family in comparison to other people. Buddha blamed the Brahmins and their whole society. He laid the whole blame at the door of the Brahmins and ignored the real cause the individual thoughts and feelings. He wanted to smash the whole society for this one reason. It was like the mosquito and the man. He forgot the truth that by his side there were other philosophers whom it was impossible for him to vanquish. He however tried the experiment. The people crushed under the feet of Brahmin priests flocked to him; and thus 600 years before Christ there was a great spectacle on the banks of the Ganges—Buddha preaching the doctrine of equality and salvation for all men—high and low. The work which Buddha did in this department was noble.

---



## JAINISM.

---

*Jainism* teaches that matter and spirit are two separate entities; they are both eternal. The universe taken as a totality had no beginning nor will it ever pass into nothingness. So far as different modifications are concerned, there is creation and destruction every moment. With regard to social rules Jainism gives no support to the institution of caste. Several centuries ago a high priest of the Jain community named Ratna-Prabha Suri happened to travel in Raputana in India and while sojourning in a town converted a number of people from among the Hindus belonging to different castes. All of them were brought by him under one name—the Jains. And even long before him, 700 years before Christ, Mahavira the Jain gymnosophist preached to the people at large that man is the noblest creature in the universe, higher than angles and gods and therefore he who looks down upon his brother-man

and takes pride as belonging to a high family or caste will have to pass through lower existence or be born low in the estimation of others. In his view caste is the outcome of human pride and vanity. And even to-day go to India and look at the marble inscription in golden letters in the Jain temple at Chitor in Central India stating that even a *chandala*, low caste Hindu should not be prohibited from coming to that temple.

---

## Contribution of Jainism to Philosophy, History, and Progress.\*

---

A Hindu story-teller tells us that once upon a time in India, four friends, a sculptor, a painter, a weaver and a Brahmin, decided to travel from place to place and see the country. In the absence of railways and stage-coaches, they travelled on foot. After passing through a thick forest, when night fell, they halted under a tree on the banks of a river. Life and property not being secure, they decided that each one of them should, for three hours, keep watch. First came the turn of the sculptor. To while away his time, he fetched a huge piece of wood which he saw at a distance and made a statue of it. At the end of three hours he retired. It was the painter's turn now to keep watch. He saw the statue and painted it. Next the weaver got up, who made a beautiful garment and dressed the statue. Lastly, the Brahmin's turn came. He looked at the

---

\* Reprinted with kind permission. Ed.

From the Asiatic Quarterly Review July 1900.

statue, which was of a woman, beautifully painted and dressed, and thought that without life it was not of much use. So with his knowledge of magic and mysticism, he introduced life into it. At day break there stood before them a beautiful woman. Each one claimed the sole credit of making her. They quarrelled and quarrelled until they came to the conclusion that each one had contributed his share in the production of the woman.

We see the same spectacle in the religious and philosophical world, each system claiming the sole credit of having given to the world the whole truth. Bearing the moral of the story in mind, I have chosen as the subject, "Contribution of Jainism to Philosophy, History, and Progress"

"Jain" (properly speaking, "Jaina") means a follower of Jina, which is a generic term applied to those persons (men and women) who conquer their lower nature (passion, hatred and the like) and bring into prominence the highest. There lived many such Jinas in the past and many will doubtless yet be born. Of such Jinas those who become spiritual heads and regenerators of the community are called Arhats (the deserving ones), or *Tirthankaras* (bridgemakers in the figurative sense—that is those by the practice of whose teaching we can cross the ocean of mundane life and reach the perfect state). Hence the Jains are also called

Arhatas. In each half-cycle of many millions of years twenty-four Arhats are born. In the present half-cycle the last Arhat, Mahavira, was born in 598 B. C., in Kundagrama, in the territory of Videha. He lived seventy-two yeays and attained *Moksha* ( liberation ) in 526 B. C.

When European scholars first began to investigate the history of Jainism, they were struck with the similarities between its ethical code and institutions and those of Buddhism; hence they thought that Jainism must be a branch of Buddhism. But thanks to the labours of Jacobi, Buhler, and Leumann, it is now conclusively proved that Jainism is much older than Buddhism. At the advent of the Buddha the Jain sect had already attained a prominent position in the religious world of India.

We may now turn our attention to the contributions made by Jainism to Philosophy. In India, as elsewhere, Philosophy became possible when the struggles for existence were followed by its enjoyment, when the spirit of conquest gave way to a life of peace and industry. The early effusions of the Aryan people, when we find them on the march of conquest of the aboriginal races of India, are invocations of prosperity on themselves and their flocks: adoration of the dawn, celebration of the struggle between the god who wields the lightning and the power of darkness, and the rendering of thanks to

the heavenly beings for preservation in battle. When they settle down, we see them engaged in a high degree of reflection. Reflection is the moving spirit of philosophy. But all primitive philosophy concerns itself with searching for the origin of the world. It postulates, after naive analysis, an original simple substance, from which it attempts to explain the multiplicity of the complex world. Philosophy in this sense assumes various forms. All of them attempt to interpret or rather formulate the law of causation and in that attempt many, fatigued after the long mental strain, stop at some one thing, element, or principle (physical or metaphysical), beyond which they have not mentally the ability to go. The Sankhya Philosophy, for instance, tries to explain evolution and even "cosmic" consciousness, and the growth of organs, etc., as proceeding from a simple substance called *Prakriti*, or primordial matter. Orthodox philosophical systems of India—that is, those based on the Vedas and the Upanishads—adopt either the theory of creation, or of evolution, or of illusion to explain the origin of the world. Whatever theory they resort to, a simple substance or substances, intelligent, or unintelligent, is or are postulated as the origin or cause of whatever there exists. Of the primal substance or substances there is no cause or origin. Early Greek Philosophers—Thales and others—considered the riddle of existence solved when the original material had been

stated, out of the modifications of which all things consist. How the original simple substance converted itself in to complex substances no philosopher explains. The Jain position in this matter being peculiar, it will be necessary to take a more extended survey of philosophy.

One of the functions of philosophy is to advance from the known to the unknown. The procedures adopted are two—induction and deduction. The inductive process is understood as that by which a general law is inferred from particular facts; the deductive process as that by which a particular fact is inferred from a general law which is assumed to be universally true. Smith, Scott, Williams and others died in the past, therefore all men are mortal; this is induction. All men are mortal; Wilson is a man; therefore Wilson will die. This is deduction. Analyzing closely these two processes, we find that in neither is there any addition of knowledge. The results are only inferences. In some cases it is mere tautology. We are not under the present development of our nature able to observe all facts; hence the induction is only a working hypothesis at the best. If we happen to meet a single exception, we have to modify the conclusion. In deduction, if the general law is found inapplicable to a particular case, we are obliged to grant that there is an additional factor in that case which does not come under

the general law. So that in both processes the results have to be verified by actual experience. By themselves they are not a permanent test. They are not always a correct measure of truth.

In the view of Jain philosophy, the measure of truth is *Samyag-jnana*, that is, knowledge purged of all infatuating elements. The constitution of man is such that as soon as he removes moral vices, his intellectual processes flow into a pure channel. I may add that knowledge as knowledge or morality as morality is not the ideal of the Jains. In fact, some kind of action always goes with every form of knowledge. We never meet with knowledge without action, or action without knowledge. True advancement consists in both being right and consistent.

Coming back to the question of the first beginnings of philosophy, we say that primitive systems, in search of reality, are satisfied when they postulate a simple substance for the explanation of the complexity of the universe. This kind of reflection, though primitive, is an improvement on the spirit of conquest, devastation, and extirpation. Centuries of peace, industry, and reflection develop better culture and higher civilization. The history of all nations bears ample testimony to this fact. India is no exception to this rule. The day on which the Aryan ancestors of modern Hindus first began to



reflect on the origin of the universe must be celebrated by them as a national holiday. Unfortunately, such a day cannot be fixed, and the Hindus have never had a national spirit.

In orthodox Hindu philosophy, the search for the First Cause is recommended, because it is supposed to land us in the realm of reality, the idea being that effects are unreal, and the true reality is the First Cause. "The reality which, being indescribable, is always mentioned in the Upanishads as it (*Tat*), is Brahmin; material manifestations being but shadows of the Eternal Ens, clothed in *name* and *form* (*Maya*—illusion)." Hence, to realize that I am and always have been Brahma is the *summum bonum*. The Jain view is that the "realization" of the primal substance, out of which the universe has manifested, is no advancement or progress. The Jains are the advocates of the development theory; hence their ideal is physical, mental, moral, and spiritual perfection. The very idea of a simple substance, without qualities, character, and activities, finds no place in the Jain philosophy, and is regarded as irrelevant and illogical; a characterless cause manifesting as a qualitative effect is a misunderstanding of the law of causation. Cause and effect, substance and manifestation, noumenon and

---

\* M. N. Dvivedi "Monism or Advaitism."

phenomenon, are really identical. Cause is a cause when it is operating, and an operating cause is itself the effect. Hydrogen and oxygen, in their ordinary condition, are not water; vibrating in a peculiar electrical way, they are not only the cause and water the effect, but water is what they are in this relation. Any object, divested of all relations, could not be called by any other name than Being or Ens. As an abstraction or generalization, the process has its use. In order to study the various aspects of things and ideas, this method of analysis is invaluable. But to call Being or "Eternal Ens" the cause or the noumenon, or the absolute, and distinguish it from the effect, calling it the unreal, phenomenon, or relative, is pseudo-analysis. The Jain process of acquiring knowledge may be described as follows: First, there is the indefinite cognition as an isolated object or idea; it is the state of the mind prior to analysis, that condition of things to which analysis is to be applied. This is what is really meant by unity, or identity, of the universe with the real which many philosophers proclaim. It makes no difference whether this unity or identity finds its home in a sensuous object or a subjective idea, the process is the same. Next comes analysis—the dissolving, separating, or differencing of the parts, elements, properties, or aspects. Last comes the synthesis, which is putting together the primi-

tive indefinite cognition—synthesis—with the subsequent analysis; so that the primitive cognition shall not be a complete annihilation or disappearance by the condensation of all differences, and so that, on the other hand, the analysis shall not be an absolute diffusiveness isolation, or abstraction, destructive of all unity, which is not the primitive unity but the relational unity of a variety of aspects. The analytical method is known in the Jain literature as *Naya-vada* (consideration of aspects). The synthetic method is known as *Syad-vada* doctrine of the inexpugnability of the inextricably combined properties and relations) or *Anekanta-vada* (doctrine of non-isolation). Voluminous works on this subject have been written by Jain scholars, all in manuscripts still unpublished

In illustration of what I have thus stated, I may remark that to a person in whom the first germ of reflection is just born the universe is a vague something, an utter mystery—at the most, a unity without differentiation; analysis leads him to consider its various aspects. He is struck with the change he sees everywhere. The constantly-running waters of rivers, decaying plants and vegetables, dying animals and human beings, strongly impress him that nothing is permanent. His first generalization, therefore, will be that the world is transitory. After years of research and reflection, he may learn that

the things that pass away still exist in an altered condition somewhere. He may now generalize that nothing is annihilated ; that notwithstanding the changes that are visible everywhere, the world, taken as a whole, is permanent. Both generalizations are true from different points of view ; each by itself is an abstraction. When one learns to synthesize, he puts together the various aspects he has found of the world, and realizes that the integrality of truth consists in the indissoluble combination of all the possible aspects. The inherence of contrary aspects in a single idea or object seems impossible to the unsynthetic mind. Sankara the well-known Vedanta scholar, has fallen into a great error when he states that the Jain doctrine should not be accepted, because " it is impossible that contradictory attributes, such as being and non-being, should, at the same time, belong to one and the same thing ; just as observation teaches that a thing cannot be hot and cold at the same moment." The Jains do not teach that a thing can be hot and cold at the same moment, but they do teach that a thing cannot be hot absolutely, and cannot be cold absolutely ; it is hot under certain definite circumstances, and cold under others. The Jain do not teach that being and non-being ( of itself ) should at the same time belong to one and the same thing. What they teach is that in a thing

there is being of itself, and non-being of other things, which means that a thing can be fully known only by knowing what it *is* and what *is not*. Sankara in fact, creates a man of straw, imputes to him imaginary doctrines, and by refuting them, he knocks him down. That is his glory.

I shall now state a few of the first principles of the Jain philosophy. Its first teaching is that the universe is not merely a congeries of substances, heaped together and set in activity by an extra-cosmic creator, but is a system by itself, governed by laws inherent in its very constitution. Law is not to be understood in the sense of a rule of action prescribed by authority, but as a proposition which expresses the constant or regular order of certain phenomena, or the constant mode of action of things or beings under certain definite circumstances. It is not a command, but a formula to which things or beings conform precisely, and without exception under definite relations, internal and external. Jainism, therefore, is not a theistic system in the sense of belief in the existence of a God as the Creator and Ruler of the universe; and still the highest being in the Jain view is a person, and not impersonal, characterless, qualityless being. All that there is in or of the universe may be classified under two heads. (1) Sentient, animate or conscious beings (*a*, liberated beings; *b*, embodied beings); and (2)

Insentient, inanimate or unconscious things or substances. There is not an inch of space in the universe where there are not innumerable minute living beings. They are smaller than the minutest things we can see with the aid of a microscope. Weapons and fire are too gross to destroy them. Their life and death depend on their vital forces, which are, of course, related to the surroundings. Clay, stones, etc., as they come fresh from the earth have life. Water, besides being the home of many living beings, is itself an assemblage of minute animate creatures. Air, fire, and even lightning have life. Strictly speaking, the physical substance of clay, water, stone, etc., is a multitude of bodies of living beings. Dry clay, dry stone, boiled water, are pure matter, and have no life. Vegetables, trees, fruits, have life. When dried or cooked there is no life in them. Worms, insects, fish, birds, animals, human beings, are all living beings. There are living beings on stars and planets, and even beyond the starry region. "Life" is only an abstraction. It is not something concrete, superadded to the constituent elements of living beings. It is a generalization, derived from our observation of varying modes of behaviour of such living beings. The stage of actual development of one living being being different from that of another, living beings are classified in many ways in the Jain philosophy. The simplest classifi-

cation is based on the number of organs of sense they have developed.

Besides the category of living being, there is one of inanimate substances. These are matter, two kinds of ether (one, the fulcrum of motion, the other, the fulcrum of rest), and space. We must bear in mind that ether and space are not matter in the Jain view. Matter has various qualities and relations which the former do not possess. Time is also called a substance in a figurative sense, a generalization of the moving activities of things and beings.

Every living being, from the minutest to the highest embodied one, is the centre of innumerable potential and actual energies, which are called *Karmas* in the Jain Philosophy. The word "*Karma*" has an interesting history. In the Vedas it means the performance of sacrifices, offering of oblations to nature-gods and names of deceased ancestors. *Karma-marga*—the path of works—is nothing but ritualistic Brahmanism. In the words of Sir Monier Williams. "Not even Jewish literature contains so many words relating to sacrifice as the literature of the Brahmins. The due presentation of sacrificial offerings formed the very kernel of all religious service. Hymn, praise and prayer, preaching, teaching, and repetition of the sacred words of Scripture were only subsidiary to this act. Every

man throughout his whole life rested his whole hopes on continually offering oblations of some kind to the gods; and the burning of his body at death was held to be the last offering of himself in fire (*antyeshti*)”

In later literature, *Karma*, in addition to the above meaning, also meant duty and good and bad actions. In the Jain literature we have a fuller meaning. It is any energy which an embodied being generates—be it vital, mental, or moral—and which keeps him in the mundane world—the *Sansara*. *Karma*, in short, is the whole *Sansaric* make-up of an embodied being. It is entirely divested of the sacrifice idea. *Karmas* which keep the individual in a backward condition are known as *Papa*; those which help him in advancement are *Punya*. The Jain philosophy gives a detailed enumeration of *Karmas*, and explains, how they are attracted (*Ashrava*) how they are assimilated with the individual (*Bandha*), how their inflow can be stopped (*Samvara*) how they can be entirely worked out (*Nirjara*), and what the ultimate state of a perfected individual is (*Moksha*). This particular branch of philosophy, therefore, includes topics like sensations, perceptions, consciousness, pains and pleasures, moralities of life, moral depravities, building of the bodies and all factors of the individuality. No other philosophical system in India has gone into so many details of life-building as Jainism has done. Like other systems, Jainism teaches the doctrine of rebirth, the nature of which



depends on the nature of the *Karmas* that are just ripe to manifest themselves soon after death.

It will be seen from the foregoing remarks that the ideal of the Jain philosophy is the physical, mental, moral, and spiritual perfection and (after death or rebirths if necessary) attainment of perfect spiritual undividedness, which does not disappear, is not dissolved, is not merged into a supreme being, is not a state of unconsciousness, but persists for ever and consists of perfected consciousness and highest rectitude. This being the goal of every living being, life in every form is highly respected by the Jains. The universe is not for man alone, but is a theatre of evolution for all living beings. Live and let live is their guiding principle. *Ahimsa parmo dharmah*—Non-injury is the highest religion. Their ceremonial worship, institutions, manners and customs (purely Jain) all rest on this grand fulcrum of *Ahimsa*. Man, in his desire to continue his life forces, so that he may do the highest good while living here, is obliged to destroy life; but the less and lower form of life he destroys, the less harmful *Karmas* he generates. This is the basis of the strict vegetarianism of the Jains. Acting on that idea, they have built homes for maimed or old animals in many cities and towns of India, where they are fed and taken care of until they die a natural death. The preaching of that grand principle has almost entirely superseded Brahminical sacrifices of animals.

In literary activity, Jains have held a prominent position. Their scholars and philosophers have composed voluminous works on philosophy, logic, comparative religion, grammar, prosody, mathematics, lexicography, music, history, biography, astronomy, etc., besides works on their ceremonial and ritualism. Out of the many authors, only a few need be mentioned here. Bhadrabahu Suri composed “*Niryuktis*” on ten works of the Jain canon, also a work on astronomy. Devarddhi Gani, the *Kshamashramana*, is the redactor of the sacred canon; 980 years after Mahavira, the last Arhat. Devarddhi, seeing that all the canonical works were being lost in course of time, caused them to be written down. Before that time the sacred literature was handed down from master to disciple without the help of books. Siddhasena, the Divakara, converted King Vikramaditya to Jainism, and is the author of many philosophical works. Haribhadra, a Brahmin by birth and a convert to Jainism, composed 1,444 *Prakaranas* (short treatises) on various subjects. Malaygin is another well-known author. Abhayadeva Suri wrote commentaries on nine principal canonical works. Devendra Suri wrote works on *Karma* etc. Dharmasagara contributed a work on the history and beliefs of heterodox sects. Hemchandra, the well-known encyclopædist, brought Prince Kumarapala of Gujarat to Jainism, and is the reputed author of three crores and a half of couplets. Yasovijaya wrote many works. Muni Atamaramji,

who died only four years ago, composed several works in popular style, thus bringing home the Jain philosophy to the masses.

In the literary world of India Jains justly claim the credit of accurate recording of history. Accurate chronicling of events and history-making seldom find a place in the ancient works of Hindus. Among the Jains, however, the case is different. Since the time of their first literary activity they have been recording the most important historical events of the time. Authors and commentators mention, at the end of their respective works, the names of their spiritual predecessors and the work done by them. *Jain Pattavalis* lists of spiritual heads of the community, with a short sketch of their lives and description of the leading events of the time, are well-known, and are being earnestly studied by German Oriental scholars and Professor Bendall of London. Jacobi, Klatt, Buhler, and last but not the least my friend Professor Leumann, of the Strassburg University, have settled many points of Jain history with the aid of these *Pattavalis*.

The sacred libraries of the Jains, established at various periods of our history for the purpose of facilitating to laymen the study of their philosophy and religion, contain thousands of manuscripts, some of which have not been allowed to be even looked at,

for the reason that the Jains, not being aware of the motives of the European scholars, are still apprehensive of the consequences of Mohammedan sacrilege and destruction of everything that is holy. The libraries of Pattan, Cambay, and Jessulmir have a worldwide reputation. A portion of manuscripts, deposited in those libraries, has been catalogued by Professors Buhler, Kielhorn, Bhandarkar, and others. Distant seems to be the day when the European scholars will take an active interest in the philosophy embodied in those works. Four canonical works have been translated into English by Professor Jacobi in the "Sacred Books of the East" series. Portions of others are translated by continental Orientalists. Almost the whole canon in original, with commentaries and Gujrati translations, has been published by the late Rai Dhanapatisinh Bahadur of Murshidabad. Some later works have been published by Bhimsinh Manek, the well-known Jain publisher of Bombay, now deceased. Much still remains to be done in the way of publication.

The Jains have been a powerful and influential community in the history of India. Some of them held high positions under native and Mohammedan rule. Writing so far back as 1829, Colonel James Tod says in his "Annals of Rajasthan".

"The number and power of these sectarians

( Jains ) are little known to Europeans, who take it for granted that they are few and dispersed. To prove the extent of their religious and political power it will suffice to remark that the Pontiff of the Kha-tataragachha, one of the many branches of the faith, has 11,000 clerical disciples scattered over India; that a single community, the Ossior Oswal, numbers 100,000 families; and that more than half the mercantile wealth of India passes through the hands of the Jain laity. Rajasthan and Saurashtra are the cradles of the Jain faith, and three out of their sacred mounts, namely, Abu, Shatrunjay, and Girnar, are in these countries. The officers of the State and revenue are chiefly of the Jain laity, as are the majority of the bankers from Lahore to the ocean. The chief magistrate and assessors of justice in Udeypur and most of the towns of Rajasthan, are of this sect; and as their voluntary duties are confined to the civil cases, they are as competent in these as they are the reverse in criminal cases from their tenets forbidding the shedding of blood. . . . Mewar has, from the most remote period, afforded a refuge to the followers of the Jain faith, which was the religion of Valabhi, the first capital of Rana's ancestors, and many monuments attest the support this family has granted to its professors in all the vicissitudes of their fortunes. One of the best preserved monumental remains in India is a column most elaborately sculptured, full 70 feet in height, dedicated to Parshvanath—in Chitor.

The noblest remains of sacred architecture, not in Mewar only, but throughout Western India, are Buddhist or Jain; and the many ancient cities where this religion was fostered have inscriptions which evince their prosperity in these countries with whose history their own is interwoven. In fine, the necrological records of the Jains bear witness to their having occupied a distinguished place in Rajput society; and the privileges they still enjoy prove that they are not overlooked "

The Jains are advocates of education. Their benefactions to Western education and intellectual progress in India are well known. The University of Bombay owes to a Jain merchant the means of erecting a stately library and a grand campanile, which are among the chief ornaments of the city. The Calcutta University has received an endowment of two lacs of rupees from the same hand. Another Jain merchant has recently bequeathed five lacs of rupees for establishing a Jain college. Female education in Gujarat depends almost entirely on Jain liberality. Many schools, libraries, and scholarships have been founded or endowed by Jains

Being devotedly attached to the religion of their ancestors, they have built sumptuous buildings and magnificent temples, the style of which commands the applause of the best architectural critics of Europe. Their most sacred place is Mount Shatrunjay, situated near Palitana, in Kathiawar. Its summits are en-

crusted with marble temples and cloisters, erected in the course of many centuries at the expense of Jain people. Several times in the year rich Jains convey large bodies of their coreligionists to this and other holy places for pilgrimage at their cost. Besides, Jain pilgrims singly and in large bands from all parts of India flock to these temples at all times of the year.

It may be noted that Lord Reay, as Governor of Bombay, having, after careful study, settled the disputes between the Jain Community and the Chief of Palitana, fifteen years ago, an address of welcome was presented to him when he, with Lady Reay, visited that hill. That was the first official and public presentation to a British representative. In conclusion, I may observe that the present Viceroy of India, Lord Curzon, in reply to an address by the Jains of Calcutta, made the following remarks.

"Among the various communities which have addressed me since my arrival in India there is none whose words of welcome awaken a more responsive echo in my breast than the Jains. I am aware of the high ideas embodied in your religion, of the scrupulous conception of humanity which you entertain, of your great mercantile influence and activity, and of the ample charities that have characterized your public and private dispensations. Previous travels in India have also familiarized me with many of your temples, in whose architectural features I have observed a refinement that reminds me of the great days of Asiatic art."

## MAN'S RELATION TO THE UNIVERSE.\*

---

The object of this course, of which this is the last lecture, is to get a concise idea how to think rightly and to study the different views and philosophies so as to arrive at the truth.

The first and second lectures dealt with the canon of interpretation, the others treated of the idea of the various systems of philosophy with regard to the soul; the law of causation, and spiritual consciousness. We have now to consider what is man's place in the universe: what is his object, and how is he going to accomplish it.

Man's present state is the result of all his previous existences and of a long continued evolution. The evolution of the soul from the archaic state to the present is a wonderful panorama. A great philosopher of India has said that the intelligent entity that now lives in the human body has come from this low

---

\*Extract of a lecture delivered in Washington, Ed.



archaic conditon and has accomplished half its round only. The other half is easy to that man who can conquer ignorance and erroneous ideas of things.

There is no ready made path for us. The first step is to realise the difference between the real and the unreal, between spiritual and non-spiritual. No man can progress until he learns to distinguish between himself and his body.

There are different kinds of souls. First, there are souls that identity themselves with the external, that believe the body is the real self. Observe a man and see if he identifies his consciousness with his body. If he does belong to this class, and as long as he clings to this idea he will have to live in an embodied condition and he cannot be liberated. Incarnation, according to all the Oriental schools is above all thing to be avoided. Some people in this country have an erroneous idea that incarnation is a good thing. It is not good in it self, only as a means to an end.

Second, there are souls that deal with the subjective state. These know that the real self is different from body and different from mind, but they are not totally liberated from the body.

Third. Supreme Soul or Spirit. The process of growing out of the external to the Supreme conditon

is this: Give up the external and through the internal or subjective state reach the supreme state. This, contains a volume of meaning. The growth must be from within, all other sciences and outside influences are only helps and auxiliaries. To give up the external is no easy thing.

There are four things difficult to obtain by the soul First, human condition. This took millions of years; Second, hearing the the truth. Truth speakers are few because there is usually some personal end to gain. The majority of human beings are so engrossed with worldly aims that they have no time to listen to the truth; Third, Right faith in the truth. Many understand the truth who do not believe in it. They consider it reflects honor on them to doubt everything. Fourth, Practice of the truth. We must go step by step in this direction There is only one way, and that is to do it, and it must be done by our own will. Nothing can compel us The smallest seed of Spirit within us is always trying to unfold Obstacles are self-created. We must remove them by our own force.

In the history of a soul there is a critical point in the human incarnation that decides for us whether we stay there or progress upwards. There is a knot of worldly desires impeding us; cut the knot by mastering desire and go forward. This done, progress is assured. A philosopher has used as an illustration of

his thought a group of ants climbing a tree. Some get tired and drop back, others are entangled in the viscid exudations of the tree, while others go to the top and partake of the fruit.

The law of habit is that within every-one which has been acquired by a continuous action of consciousness in a certain line. If we have made a habit, we can unmake it. The individual entity has many personalities. The physical body has been formed through the habit of thinking that the body itself is the self.

Understanding the whole elements of the human being in this way, the next step is to gain the mastery of our desires, to change them into higher forces.

With regard to this progress, there are two ways of making it. One is natural, the other scientific. The natural method means to make no exertion but to resign ourselves into the hands of the forces around us. This takes a long time, and we are likely to be stationary. We may be attracted by worldly things and be retarded. The experiences of these react and teach us better, but we have to stay embodied a long time to learn in this way. According to the scientific method the path is narrow. We must transmute desire into spiritual force. It is in the power of everyone to take this decisive step.

This whole philosophy requires a knowledge of

the law of cause and effect so as to determine before hand what will be the result of actions.

There is no secrecy about this philosophy; the Hindu thought despises secrecy. We have a popular saying that one who keeps knowledge secret when he might give it out, will be born next time as an alligator. (Being questioned at the close of the lecture as to whether this really meant that the human being would be degraded into the form of an alligator, Mr. Gandhi replied that it was used as a proverb, or like our saying of one who has done a foolish thing, that he has made an ass of himself.)

Man is a compound being with many factors. As there are causes which obscure the sense consciousness, so there are causes which obscure the spiritual consciousness. It is the mind which causes bondage and which causes liberation. Beside the factors of causation, there are other pains and pleasures, or the lack of them, the personality, etc., and each factor has causes back of it. The individuality is always the same ; the personality is always changing.

---

## INDIA'S MESSAGE TO AMERICA.

---

My brothers and sisters of America I greet you in the name of India and her three hundred millions of sons and daughters. I recognize in you my brothers and sisters, from whom I seem to have travelled away, ages ago, to visit the orient, and now I return to you with a message from that country—a message of peace, of love, of universal brotherhood and therefore of universal fellowship. I stand before you on a common level, not on the relationship of master and servant nor of the conqueror and the conquered. I hail you, my brothers and sisters, with all my heart and with all my soul, and while I stand before you with that feeling, I represent not myself alone, but the voiceless millions of India. I come to you at your invitation and at your courtesy. It is the first time in the history of nations that this vast country, the American country, sent a cordial invitation to the farthest country, India, on the other side of the globe. It is a crown of glory in the history of this new nation, the nation so progressive, so intellectual, so tolerant. It is an honor to India to partake

of the festive board, the intellectual, the religious, the philosophical board which you have spread for her entertainment. You did invite us, not because you are kings and emperors who have authority to command us, but you bid us as brothers of the same family and as progenitors of the civilization which you now enjoy. It is a commemoration of the completion, so to speak, of one cycle of life, a picture of the beginning and the end, the Alpha and the Omega, because the first representative of race is invited to commune with the last and best in opportunities of races. That this new American nation, the youngest child in the history of nations has wisely and hospitably invited the aged and well-preserved nation from the farthest country to the entertainment, is without precedent in the history of the world.

It is a pleasing thought to my country that she finds parallels of epochs or stages in the development of human lives and races. While you Americans tell of your Washington, who was "first in peace, first in war, and first in the hearts of his countrymen," so we, also, have our Washington, who many centuries ago embalmed himself in the institutions of my country. No greater man than King Ashoka has ever reigned in India and no succeeding monarch has equalled his glory. He was inspired by a liberal and catholic spirit in his internal administration and in his foreign policy, and the profound love of truth and the desire to spread the truth, have made his name a household word from Siberia to Ceylon.

You have had your Abraham Lincoln who was the regenerator of your country, a second Washington. We had also our Abraham Lincoln, the victor of a great and patriotic war, the patron of reviving Hinduism, the center of all that is best and most beautiful in modern Sanskrit literature, and the subject of a hundred legends Vikrama the Great, is to the Hindu what Charlemagne is to the French, what Alfred is to the English, and what Harun-Er-Rashid is to the Mohammedan. To the learned as to the illiterate, to the poet as to the story teller, to the old man as to the school-boy, his name is as familiar in India as the name of any prince or potentate or mighty leader in any country. Tender recollections of Shakuntala and Urvashi rise in the minds of Hindu scholars with the name of that prince in whose court Kalidasa flourished. Hindu astronomers cherish the memory of that great patron of Varaha-Mihira, and Hindu lexicographers honor the name of the potentate who honoured Amara-Sinha, and as if the true claims of glory were not enough, a hundred tales familiarize his name to the illiterate and simple, so that in this sense history does repeat itself and teaches that after all, nations are preserved, regenerated and liberated to higher planes of realization, achievement and prosperity in material and spiritual things, by human embodiments of those divine forces which are universal, and which, when rightly under-

stood, are answerable for human destinies. You Americans are living in the realization of the ancient dreams of the philosophers of India and the East. The means of the growth and human uplifting are great here. Our prophets and philosophers of the East have laid the foundations of them and it is now for you to build on those foundations. This is the message of India, which she delivers to you and through you to the whole American nation. With this message, also, come more than simple greeting and recognition. The young American nation is in a condition to rightly appreciate the treasures of the ancient lore and sublime philosophy of India and the Orient, because, intellectually considered, this is virgin soil, and with the message which I bring to America comes also the fraternal invitation to you to study and understand this philosophy.—The key to the archives of our ancient history and lore is placed in confidence in your lap, and you are invited to unlock for yourselves, with our permission and co-operation, this vast storehouse which contains the treasures of our ancient philosophy and achievements. Why? because you are young; because you are studious, unbaised, free—and these are the conditions which answer for receptivity.

Certain of your missionaries have informed you wrongly of our history and condition, of our moral stature and of our religion. It is because they have



studied us from the outside, and with eyes blinded by prejudice, the result of limited view of the universal cult, the universal law of brotherhood and love. We attribute these wrong impressions and wrong conjectures not to spite, malice or evil purpose, but ignorance, to a lack of knowledge, which a larger plane of universal brotherhood will cause to disappear. When missionaries who are sent from this continent to our country and to our people shall learn that we are children of the same family, that we inherit the same perceptions, the same rights, the same inspirations and the same relations to infinite, and when they seek to fraternize with us on that plane and with this recognition—then, and then only, antagonism and injustice will cease and the bonds of common brotherhood will unite us in a mutual recognition of reasons for a perfect fellowship. You can bring us no new revelation, but you can recognize in us the old and everlasting truth which is the common birthright of all souls, which is only new to you because you are the latest born. If, in the freshness and innocence of your zeal and limited knowledge of us, you conceive us to be idolators, bowing down to stone and metal gods made by our own hands, it is because you have as yet failed to grasp our conception of the simple and natural aids to faith to, contemplation, to apprehension and to duty, through which all souls must climb, as up the eternal stair of progress, from height to height, from lowest condi-

tions through all grades to regeneration and liberation, and up to the perfect state. But despite all this, to you we confidently look for that recognition of truth in us which shall lead to the universal fellowship which the law of universal brotherhood implies

We come gladly, at your invitation, for another reason. You are the most tolerant and liberal nation in the Western world, and tolerance is the first article in the faith of every Hindu, Buddhist or Jainist. No man can point to any instance in the history of my people where any man was ever persecuted for religious opinion's sake. Our very language does not contain an equivalent word for the English word "persecution." We have words in our language in the ancient Sanskrit, that cover the whole ground of justice, purity, of godness, of love and of all the sweet beatitudes of the soul's attainment, but not one word that means malice, persecution or tyranny for religious opinion's sake

It may be "objected to this statement of mine, which objection may be founded on statements of distinguished ecclesiastics, such as Bishop Caldwell, who has lived in India for many years, that the Hindus worship gods of destruction, but acquaintance with us will prove that we do not worship gods in the sense conveyed, but they represent to us ideas of retribution and penalty and destruction for the wrongdoing and misdoing of man, and we seek to appease wrath and

propitiate justice by approaching the methods of a holy life. This same Bishop says: "The people of India worship as gods, Vishnu, Shiva, Krishna and various similar gods. The very names of these divinities are unknown in any other country—Shiva, Vishnu and the rest of the Hindu divinities are worshipped as gods by the people of India alone. If they were really gods, they would certainly be gracious to the people of India. They would certainly give proof of it by abasing the white men, who do not worship them, and by exalting their worshipers; they would bestow on the Hindoo unbounded wisdom, power and prosperity, and would probably give to them the government of the rest of mankind. How widely different is the condition of the Hindus, the supreme government of every part of India is in the hands of Christians."

This is the sheet anchor of the argument of Christian superiority in India. But that is an old, old argument. The Mohammedans, for 800 years have presented the same argument with the sword in one hand and the Koran in the other. Where are they to-day? Echo answers, where? Every person has his day. This is the Christian's day, and he is producing the same argument at the point of the bayonet. The so-called disciples of the Bible believe in "power" as the supreme manifestation and demonstration of the truth. So do we, but we go one step further and are declaring and have declared for thousands of years to

the world that power, indeed, is the test of truth, but goodness is the highest power in the world. If it is powerful to do it is a hundred times more powerful suffer. Outpourings of cruel savages over the land of Bharata, and "civilized" scourges of the human race have been let loose upon the plains of beautiful India over and over again, but, like meteors coming out of eternal darkness, flashing for a moment across her horizon of view and plunging back into darkness, all these oppressors and tyrants, with all their claims of truth and power to subdue, civilize and christianize, must in the long run, melt like morning mist on the river and the Hindu will live on, firm in his faith that goodness is the highest power in the world and not oppression

I concede, my brothers and sisters, that in India as elsewhere, men may combine together for wrongdoing, and have done so, but when they did so it was in contravention of the sacred truths, ignorantly interpreted and ignorantly applied, and not in accordance with the dogma of religion nor the inspiration of philosophy or civilization. Under the highest forms of the Christian religion, you will bear me witness, these things also have been done, but do we hold Christianity rightly responsible for the cruelty, injustice and wrong? Some may, but we do not. No more can you hold our philosophy and our religion responsible for abnormal conceptions and perpetrations.

You know, my brothers and sisters, that we are not an independent nation, we are subjects of her Gracious Majesty, Queen Victoria, the "defender of the faith," but if we were a nation in all that that name implies, with our own government and our own rulers, with our laws and institutions controlled by us free and independent, I affirm that we should seek to establish and for ever maintain peaceful relations with all the nations of the world. We would seek neither to lessen your dignity nor to encroach upon your right or domain, and we would ask for that recognition in the family of nations which you already concede to us in the family of man. The Sanskrit poet says: "This is my country, that is your country, these are the conceptions of narrow souls: to the liberal-minded the whole world is a family."

For your inventions, and for whatever is just in your methods of industry, for whatever is humane and wise in your forms of education, and for whatever is pure and useful in your government and in your civilization, we would offer you in exchange the sublime teachings of our prophets and our poets, and for all the people cordial fraternity and perfect reciprocity.

I have heard your orators speak on many questions, among them the so-called vital question of money which is above all things the most coveted commodity. but I, as a Hindu, as a Jainist, in the name of my countrymen and of my country, would

offer you as the medium of the most perfect exchange between us, henceforth and forever, the indestructible the unchangeable, the universal currency of good will and peace, and this, my brothers and sisters, is a currency that is not interchangeable with silver and gold, it is a currency of the heart, of the good life, of the highest estate on the earth and it is the currency of heaven. The civilization whose highest badge is the perishable symbol of corruption and greed, silver and gold, is not to be compared to that civilization whose highest symbol is the image of peace, and whose highest expression is good-will towards man and all living beings. Our Jain poet says "Spirit of peace and perfect bliss, devoid of impure and destructive parts, Glory be to Thee."

Because of these principles and doctrines underlying our lives as a people, from the earliest ages, we have been the victims of misgovernment and tyranny through oppression, from the first Persian invasion to the latest Christian invasion and conquest, but through it all we have borne ourselves with a patience, a patience of hope without a parallel in history, firmly adhering to our ancient faith, believing that in the end goodness will triumph over all oppression, all tyranny, for it is an axiom with us that goodness is the highest power and will eventually prevail. Here, you may say, that such is not the history of India. I will, therefore, confirm my own statement by that of one of the greatest Oriental Scholars in Europe, Prof. Max Muller.

"I confess it has always seemed to me one of the saddest chapters in the history of the world to see the early inhabitants of India, who knew nothing of the rest of the world, of the mighty empires of Egypt and Babylon, of their wars and conquests, who wanted nothing from the outside world and were happy and content in their own earthly paradise, protected as it seemed by the mountain ramparts in the north and watched on every other side by the jealous waves of the Indian Ocean, to see these happy people suddenly overrun by foreign warriors, whether Persians, Greeks or Macedonians, or at a later time, Scythians, Mohammedans, Mongolians and Christians, and conquered for no fault of theirs, except that they had neglected to cultivate the art of killing their neighbors. They themselves never wished for conquests, they simply wished to be left alone and to be allowed to work out their views of life which was contemplative and joyful, though deficient in one point, namely, the art of self-defence and destruction. They had no idea that a tempest could break upon them and when the black clouds came suddenly driving through the northern and western mountain-passes, they had no shelter they were simply borne down by superior brute force. They remind us of Archimedes imploring the cruel invader not to disturb his philosophical circles, but there was no help for them. That ideal of human life which they had pictured to themselves and which to a

certain extent they seemed to have realized before they were discovered and disturbed by the 'outer barbarians,' had to be surrendered. It was not to be. The whole world was to be a fighting and a huckstering world, and even the solution of the highest problems of religion and philosophy was in future to be determined, not by sweet reasonableness, but by the biggest battalions. We must all learn that lesson, <sup>but</sup> but even to the 'hardened' [historian it is a sad lesson to learn."

Such has been the case of the people of India from earliest times. Our physical resistance in every instance has been spasmodic under the goadings of injustice, for the reason that in our philosophy and religion there is no curriculum nor science of war, only the holy breathings of lessons and principles that make for peace and brotherhood. Cruelty and reprisals have been charged upon us, which charge we do not fully deny, since the worm will turn under the remorseless tread of the ruthless invader, but even in the paroxysm of such madness, overborne by greater power and cruelty and in the agonies of undeserved death and extermination, we still clung to the prayer of our holy faith, "We forgive all living beings. We ask all living beings to forgive us."

To my American Christian brothers and sisters who are before me and through them to the whole of Christendom, I have to say a few words



I have learned since coming to this country that the great shibboleth of the host of Christendom is, "The whole world for Christ." What is that? What do you mean? Who is that Christ in whose name you propose to conquer the world? Is there a Christ of oppression? Is there a Christ of injustice? Is there a Christ of misinterpretation? Is there a Christ of denial of all rights? Is there a Christ of destruction of all holy aims and humane immemorial institutions? Is there a Christ of unjust and exorbitant taxation for the support of a government, foreign to our knowledge, our thought, our religion and our consent? Who of these Christs has inscribed his name on the banner of your conquests? If you seek to conquer us under such banners and in the name of such Christs, we refuse to be conquered. But, if you come to us in the name and spirit of the Christ of Education of Brotherhood, of universal love, or in the name of that Christ, who, in the valley of the Ganges and on the shores of the sea of Tiberius more than 1800 years ago, taught and said "A new commandment give I unto you, that ye love one another;" then I say we will welcome you, for Him we know and of Him we are not afraid. But all this must be understood in the full freedom of it. We cannot recognize a creedal Christ, a limited Christ, an emasculated truth, whether it is viewed from an educational or from a moral and spiritual point of view, but the universal idea, without limit, without fetters—free.

I have<sup>d</sup> learned since here in this country why it that in my own country different missionaries and Christian teachers antagonize one another. It is because the disciples are no better than their masters; because I find in this country many Christianities and the multiplied disagreements amounting to mutual oppression and excommunication, teach me that, either there be many Christs or that the one Christ is dismembered and torn, and divided up among many factions, who in quarrelling over their several possessions accomplish nothing but the destruction of the real truth.

We heathens of India recognize the many-sidedness of truth, and are divided into schools of philosophy and truth for the promulgation of truth as we see it, but nevertheless we are united very deep in one thought, one conception, one adoration and one worship of the true and only infinite source of perfection the Christ of all humanity. From this point of view he may be called Bramah, Vishnu, Shiva, Buddha, Jina, or the Christ of Nazareth we have no objections, but in the deep and true appreciation of Him, these names must signify one life, one source, one manifestation and one universal expression of love. The Jain poet says. "I praise him who has destroyed the seeds of physical death and birth, be he Brahma, Vishnu, Shiva or Jina." These prayers were composed before the birth of Jesus or of Buddha—had they lived before their composition, their names would have been added.

I have borrowed from the Christian scriptures what was spoken by the mouth of Jesus and is called "a new commandment," but in truth it is an old, old commandment, which in the beginning came from the lips and loving natures of our great prophets and teachers, and is not new to us, and is, therefore easily recognized. When the old and the new truth are appreciated and conformed to, then will come to pass that vision of the ancient prophets and seers, in the daily opportunities and methods of man, the principle in the active work of what you call "co-operation," which is the first proof of brotherhood. From this point also we may truly study and certainly obtain some knowledge of that condition of perfect bliss for which we yearn, and the conditions of which in the lessons I have tried to express are founded, and this for all souls and forever.

On this ground also we stand to learn and to know the purpose and the methods of true worship. That worship is not to a person a mere existence who may be conceived as a supreme being only, but it extends to a holy, worthy, pure and perfected ones, who by this method have attained a perfect state and who by their example and virtues and the achievements of their austerities and devotions have made the way for us simple and sweet. We, the Jainists of India say every day in our prayer: "I worship all perfected souls; I worship all spiritual masters; I worship all spiritual instructors; I worship all, holy men

and women in the world.' You will say my Christian brothers and sisters, that this act of homage and worship should be directed to the Supreme being only, whom you call God; but you also worship the name of Christ, and who is he if he be not a manifestation and accommodation of some element, especially—Love that is the worshipful in the divine being. And in the recognition and devout worship of that same manifestation which is the cause of our conquests and of all perfected lives, do not we bring ourselves into closer relations, and is not, therefore our worship truer and worthier to be accepted. And this also is the universal worship, the tribute that all life makes in spontaneous gratitude and devotion to the Infinite. In this act of worship we are in fellowship with all living things and with all living beings. This worship may have no voice, no particular ceremony and no outward expression cognizable to the senses, but it must be and it is, the prostration of the soul before the Supreme in adoration, and in the conformity of love, the lesson of life. In all nature, animate and inanimate, of all graces and forms and expressions form the spire of grass protecting the lowly violet in the vale, to the songs of birds which rise on graceful wings in the pulsing atmosphere, whose pulsations are notes of worship, to the stately forest, bending under the pressure and expanding in the light of nature's growth, up to the vaulted heavens "singing as they shine, the hand that made us is

divine," and still up into the higher sentient life, the souls of men, and still up to the perfect life—to the dwellers and realizers of the perfect bliss—through all the same spirit inspires and leads, and makes the worship one.

This is the true idea of Hindu worship. How do you like it? Does it not touch the cord of sympathy and acceptance in your heart? My American brothers and sisters, it is not a propagandism that I speak of, but a spirit, a universal spirit of love and power and answerable for the practical realization of brotherhood, the brotherhood not only of men, but of all living things, which by the prophets of all nations is indeed taught, but which by the practice of the world is yet ignored.

This is the message of India to America. I have delivered it, conscious of my own weakness and inability to do justice to the spirit in which it was sent, and gratefully conscious also of that charity and brotherly love characteristic of your nation, in which it will be received.

I will now conclude with a prayer, which in India, we daily offer:

"May peace rule the universe; may peace rule in kingdoms and empires; may peace rule in states and in the lands of the potentates; may peace rule in the house of friends and may peace also rule in the house of enemies."

---

## IMPRESSIONS OF AMERICA.

---

My brothers and sisters of America. By your indulgence and brotherly kindness, I have been permitted to deliver to you the message which I was commissioned to bear from my people in India to you, and it has been received in the spirit in which I endeavoured to present it. For this not unexpected reception, but none the less therefore grateful to me, I do not find words at my command to express my gratitude

My subject to-day may be properly called "Impressions that I have received during my sojourn in this country," the impressions of various characters which may or may not be correct.

In presenting these impressions I shall not be able to do so in as connected and perfect a manner as more nature consideration would enable me to do therefore, you will be prepared to overlook what may appear to be a desultory or fragmentary discourse. I deem it my duty and feel under obligations to give utterance to the impressions which I

have received, but I must beg you, my brothers and sisters, to acquit me in the very beginning of approaching this subject in any particular, in the spirit of criticism. It might seem to be the most politic and the politest thing to do, to refrain from uttering an opinion that might be construed adverse in any direction, and to give my impressions only of the delightful and pleasurable things that have come under my notice. In the main this will be true in all I may have to say, for what I shall say will be said in sincerity, and because in the immaturity of my thought, I cannot do otherwise.

My first impression concerns the hospitality of the American people. This is an impression that has grown with every day's and with every hour's acquaintance. I do not mean by this that what I have been permitted to say on all occasions, respecting the people of my own country, their philosophy and their religion, has met with unchallenged acceptance. What I mean to say and do say, is, that in every instance I have been received with perfect cordiality, and have been listened to with the friendliest attention. I came to America with liberal expectations, and when I say ( which I gladly do ) that thus far my fondest expectations have been more than realized, I only state the truth in moderate terms, for this is true in America as in India, that back of all outward expressions of welcome, of tole-

rance and reciprocity, there is the spirit which is larger and deeper, and prophetic of greater expressions than a short acquaintance can give. Whatever permanent lessons, favourable or unfavourable, I may carry away with me, I am sure that this impression will not be weakened, but deepened and heightened. What I have said refers to all portions of the country that I have visited, and to all classes of people that I have had the honor to meet, but it is due to you who are before me, the representatives of and believers in Spiritualism, dwelling temporarily in this beautiful Cassadaga, which I have heard called the "Mecca of Spiritualism in America," that I should say, that the welcome you have accorded me and the interest you have shown in my mission, and the attention you have given to my feeble words, intensify the impression that I have referred to and touch my heart in a way I shall never forget. It is impossible for me to put in words the permanent effect these delightful soiritual and intellectual communings will have upon me after I return to my native land—only this—I know it will be good and only good and that continually. When I shall speak to my family and my people of all this and then show them pictures of you until your faces shall become familiar to them, the bonds of sympathy that shall unite us will strengthen and strengthen, and vibrate in mutual and in increasing fellowship.



The next thing that impresses me with peculiar significance is that system of popular education which you call the "common school." Through the hospitable facilities afforded on every hand, I have learned much of your great institutions of learning, universities, colleges, gymnasiums, schools of art, schools of music and of applied science, and standing in the fresh morning of your national life, I have gazed upon these monuments of your intellectual progress and industry with wonder and amazement and also with gratitude. but when I come to study that system of education, which is in a way, peculiar to your country, and which brings the school and the school-master to all people, to the children of the humblest and the lowest on equal terms with the children of the wealthy and the proud, my admiration and my wonder yield to a sense of appreciation that I may call devout and religious. For, although I and my people in the narrow view of a mere sectarian, may be esteemed ignorant, superstitious and idolatrous we, the people of India, especially those who have been permitted to pass through the curriculum of education, hold to the doctrine that at the bottom of all progress and answerable for all happiness is universal education. Also, that this education must be free, also, that it must be necessary, that is, that it must include those lessons that pertain to physical life, its relations and perfections, as well as to the cultivation of the intellectual faculties and the mora-

lities of life. It is possible that what I now say for my own people on this subject will surprise a few of my hearers, but I am proud and honored to be able, to say that this prime requisite of human progress, the education of the masses, is a doctrine held and taught and enforced, and practiced by the Jain community to which I belong, from the very beginning, as is proved by our history, and without interruption. In respect of my Hindu people, other than Jains, including the Brahmins and the believers in the Vedas, candor requires that I should say that with the exception of particular schools for the education of Brahmins only, this doctrine has not obtained since the innovation of priestly exclusiveness, which made the privilege of education the right of one class only. This admission which I freely make, ought not to weaken what I have said on this subject on behalf of the Jain community. It was a member of the Jain community who contributed 400,000 rupees for the purpose of erecting a university building and the creation of a library in the same, in the city of Bombay; this same gentleman endowed the University of Calcutta for purposes of scholarship with 200,000 rupees. The munificence on the part of this same gentleman and many others of our community, has established schools in different parts of our country for the education of girls as well as boys, which education is also free. It is the hope which has been bequeathed to us by our forefathers, and which is also a factor in

our civilization, and it is our purpose also, to extend the work of education with all of our abilities with or without governmental aid, on that principle which is found in your Christian Scriptures, that "a little leaven, leaveneth the whole lump." Time must elapse before we shall realize the great consummation, but patience and perseverance, with the encouragement of all enlightened people, and especially of you, the liberal Americans, will eventually triumph. What I have learned of your great system of education of the masses, which I admit cannot be very great or particular for the reason that my observations have been necessarily limited, is to me an encouragement beyond words to express, if my impressions are just and true.

If my understanding of your institutions and your form of government is correct, and if I might be permitted to express an opinion, I would say that that education which is now offered to the people free to be accepted or rejected, must soon become compulsory, as a measure of preservation of those very institutions. Of the different systems adopted by you, I may not speak with certainty, but the impressions which I have received concerning these methods, from the kindergarten to the university, are both pleasing and profitable in my thought. What lessons we, the people of India, may be able to receive from deeper acquaintance with you and your institutions, I may not even attempt to express or enumerate. I can only speak of the gratitude which I feel in the fact

that it has been my privilege to examine, to learn and to witness the effects of this system of education which, you call free, "common" and which is so popular with you.

The third impression to which I must refer concerns the vastness of your material resources and the unnumerable institutions of industry, together with the greatness of your home or interstate commerce. From this point of view, the material side of your civilization is almost beyond grasp. The difficulty of appreciating this view of your great country is not small to one who comes from a country of quieter activities and more contemplative methods, and the first thought is that your civilization's first achievement is the multiplication of wants and necessities, of cravings and luxuries and of material means to questionable ends. This may be a superficial view to be set aside and substituted by a better, upon a better acquaintance. It would also seem impossible from the same point of view, to understand how the physical, the moral and the intellectual sides of civilization can keep pace with the activities, the demands and the luxuries of the material. This problem, however, belongs to you, and only time can solve it. But whether or not the essential equilibrium is now realized, or may ever be, it remains true that your industrial progress on all lines of materiality in the arts also, and in certain sciences, and in inventions and other things which go to aid the energy and labor of

man, is marvellous to see. I have learned also that this question does not alone propose itself to me, who have not had opportunities to study it sufficiently. It is also disturbing the thought of this nation. The unrest, the unequal condition apparent in industrial society, the growth of monopolies, the concentration of wealth and its many encroachments, creating antagonisms where there should be harmony, and prophesying dangers where there should be security, are factors, which if true, threaten that peace and prosperity which it is the wish of all right thinking people all over the world that you may always enjoy.

In the name of India and her people, I offer the prayer that the evil which many of your wisest statesmen foresee, and which vast portions of your population seem to fear may never, never, overtake you. If the evils and dangers to which I have referred to really exist, then, it will be the part of wisdom and humane method in the industrial life, and in the social life, and in the patriotic government, to allay apprehensions, to destroy antagonisms, and to restore confidence by mutual concessions and the just application of the universal law, which you called the "Golden Rule:" "Do unto others as you would that others should do unto you."

The next impression that I shall speak of concerns the social state and the family life of the American people as it has come under my observation.

In some particulars this impression is unfavourable in others very grateful. In all thought, both in India and in America, as I can conceive it, the establishment of the family is at the base of the whole social structure, and is essential to social and material happiness, and should be, and I hope is, held to be sacred. A nation of families in the right view, must be (other things being equal) a happy nation, although that happiness may not include great material wealth or commercial achievements, for the home where the family is, is the heaven on earth if it is constituted and preserved within the sacred meaning of the word itself.

But I find in this great country of yours, not unity of conception and practice, but great diversity, and that diversity--if my impression is correct--is a diversity of unhappy contradictions. I do not understand how it can be that home relations, which answer for family, by which I mean the ties and the children of our love, can be so easily broken. In your country when the son marries he leaves the paternal roof, the home in which he was born and reared, and separates himself from that circle, and establishes a different home beyond the limits of the old home; he creates as it were, (if I understand it) a separate, a distinct home for himself. This fear of living in the same family for a generation is very prevalent, I think in this country. This feature of your social life is peculiar in my view and is not realized nor desired

among us. There seems to be a dread of enlarging the home circle by bringing into it the wife of the brother, with you. Perhaps you are afraid of the mother-in-law, as I have heard. With us it is different. The home of the father of the son who marries the daughter of a different family, is, from that moment, the home of the daughter who is now the wife and she loves not her husband only, but her mother-in-law, her father-in-law her brother-in-law--in fact, all the members of the family into which she is adopted or brought, and her rights and privileges are equally sacred and as inviolable in the family, as the son's whose wife she is. In your country, if the husband, dies leaving the wife a widow, it is often the case, if not always, if my impression is right, that she is left to provide for herself unless the estate of her husband is left to her and is sufficient. Perhaps, it is this which necessitates remarriage and the establishment of new ties of the same nature in a different direction and with a new mother-in-law who may be appreciated in the same way, so that now she is related by marriage to two families and is in our conception, a member of neither. You will, therefore, ask me, what is the difference in my country ? It is this. the daughter-in-law becomes a member *bona fide*, not legally; *per se* not incidentally, of the family into which she marries. If she is left a widow she does not need to remarry in order to obtain the comforts and the protections of home, but the home in which

she is, is her home, with all that the word implies, so long as she lives, and it is the duty and the sacred pleasure of the members of the family to provide for her, to love her and protect her just the same as if her husband were by her side. I do not mean to say that under no circumstances is remarriage permissible. On the contrary there are certain classes of people and religious communities who live on the lowest plane of spirituality whose widows do remarry but we say that the reasons for that remarriage are unworthy and pertain entirely to that nature which we call "animal." I do not pass judgment on either of these modes of life at this time. What I desire to do is to present the contrast which will account for the unfavourable impressions which your system has made upon me. It may be that your philosophers and socialists can present many reasons for this state of things and many arguments in its defence, but to the Hindu mind, the basic principle of the family and the ties which bind into unity its several members, are violated by you, and that for this reason it must be impossible for you to attain the highest social state.

Another thing that I have learned is that divorce is a common and sometimes a coveted feature in your social civilization. I will say that this feature also impresses me unfavorably. It would seem that there is a lack of something—you may call it wisdom, love power of selection, or what you will—lying at the



bottom of this fact. The truth, however, must be conceded, that thousands of persons who marry and start out in the separate and independent way of which I have spoken, apart from the family of the husband, soon, for some cause, grow tired of each other, and are separated by the strong hand of your legal civilization by divorce. With us, what you call divorce is not known, except in the lowest class of society, which class is not of the Aryan origin—in other words, not real Hindu. What I mean to say, with more explicitness, is, that Hindu jurisprudence and sacred books do not provide for or recognize divorce. The reason of this, which I may not do more than state, is found in our conception of the ground and reasons for marriage and the family tie. These are sacred and inviolable, and they hold through all circumstances, and cannot be weakened nor set aside. Marriage in our view is spiritual as well as physical matehood. The husband and wife are one and indivisible in this view; they have not two roads, and two destinies, and separate attractions, and different objects, whether of desire or devotion. They are one in thought, in purpose, in religious devotion, in sacred relations, with a destiny in the true light, that is also not divided. It is, of course, impossible to bring before our limited view in this earthly state, the full and perfect relations, and the blissful conditions of the perfected souls of men and women, but the Hindu widow is forever a wife, and prays every day

that in that future of perfect bliss, she may join her husband, and believes that she will. This does not mean in any physical sense, but that the perfection which is attained by the religious observances and soul growth of the husband shall also be hers, so that the unity in the marriage relations, in the spiritual interpretation of them, is perpetual. But we, the Jains of India, also teach that in the perfect condition, soul is without sex, there is no man-soul or woman-soul in the sex sense, in that perfect state. In the perfect state recognition obtains and the individuality in the real sense of it is not lost. If you can conceive of the souls of husband and wife in the perfect state, looking back to the human state with its physical relations of sex, you may also conceive of their saying that that human condition was true, and just and holy, and necessary within its horizon, but that those relations were means to an end, also sacred and that the true relation which now we realize in the perfect state, where sex does not enter in, is the true and permanent relation.

I must also speak of the impressions that I have received in relation to the government and politics of your great country. I will say that as far as I have been able to grasp it, your theory of government is also among the monuments of Western civilization. I cannot command words to express my admiration of that theory, if I take the theory from the undying

words of that great man, Abraham Lincoln, who said that "this is a government of the people for the people, and by the people" That statement is too great to be discussed in one hour, or in one year or in many years It is a statement that opens up possibilities and realizations which imply a perfect condition in the outcome of the human society. I, a Hindu, interpret it to mean self-government in the highest sense. I must own to some anxiety for the future of the theory in the practical realization, when I consider the political contentions and extremes which seem to co-exist Perhaps my view is superficial, perhaps these outward demonstrations and irreconcilable political antagonisms on party lines and for party supremacy, may be mere excrescences or breaking waves upon the bosom of a deep sea whose unity and unific power shall abide undisturbed, unvexed and supreme This is my hope.

Finally, my brothers and sisters, with your kind indulgence, I will speak somewhat of my impressions regarding the religion and the religious condition of the American nation. I will ask you again to consider what I may say as the expression of impressions which I have received, subject always to revision and correction, and in no sense spoken in a spirit of criticism. The opinion which I had formed from contact with Western civilization in my own country, and with missionaries and missionary methods among my

people, was not of a nature to contribute to the emotion of admiration of what may be called your "religion." Upon coming to this country and viewing you from higher and closer point of view, my first impression was in the nature of an agreeable surprise, I as a heathen, so-called, was received at the great Parliament of Religions, yours inculded, and by you especially in the spirit of that brotherly love which is one of the fundamental principles of the universal religion. This great welcoming spirit of brotherly love, of absolute tolerance, of illimitable fraternity, is the real expression of your national religion, in my impression, and differs in nothing from the spirit of my own religion, and therefore, I wonder why this spirit does not control in all directions The spirit is true, it is universal, but its expression in dogmas and creeds and contending churches, seems in conflict with itself How can narrowness, and bigotry, and limitations, and worldliness, and worship of mammon, and oppression and extortion, and enmity, and unbrotherly attitude and conduct, be natural expressions of the universal holy spirit of brotherly love ? Can you tell me, since I cannot enlighten myself ? If you say these expressions of outward signs mean nothing, I answer: Whence do they come, whither do they tend, why do they have place, why have they not been banished ? If they mean nothing, they can have no mission, and are not the influences and children, and powers and

reflections of that great spirit of goodness which is, love to all living beings. I do not claim superiority, I do not arrogate to myself or to my people the right to judge or to criticise. But you say to me, you are our brother, and some of you say you are our *elder* brother and therefore, if I am your brother (and I *am* your brother) I ask you why do you persecute, condemn and devour one another in the sense in which one form of christianity antagonizes another, and one sect of Christians excommunicates another, and why, in some instances, in your conception of missionary duty, do you even excommunicate me? Only this I will say, because I am your brother, me you shall not excommunicate; my people you shall not relegate to the uncovenanted mercies of God ! It is the spirit of your religion, as well as of my own, that the Supreme Being is the source and essence of goodness, and that all living beings are in a sense, the children of that Supreme Being, therefore, all men are brothers, therefore, the tie that binds us in this brotherhood is not difference, nor hate but love; and what is love, my brothers and sisters ? Is it a sentiment merely ? An expression merely ? It is only a word that can be interpreted in many ways or not interpreted at all ? We say in our sacred books, "Love is only of one kind, which binds together all the universe and which destroys all differences, without creating any quarrelsome opinions and jealousies and other wrong states of mind."

I conclude, dear brothers and sisters, by saying that standing on this foundation, looking into one another's faces in the spirit and realization of true religion, if the past is glorious, the future, both for you and for us, will be more glorious. We need but to become better acquainted with one another and with the holy truths of universal religion, to enter upon paths of progress and spirituality, which, leading us out of the material and transitory, shall bring us into the perfect state where conflict and antagonisms and evil passions shall never enter. To aid in bringing about this needful condition, and to discover the true methods of its attainment, we may be missionaries to one another in a truer sense, in a better sense and even in a holier sense, than that word has ever been interpreted to mean. By recognizing the right relations we shall come upon the right method, and in the unity of the spirit, we shall have the bond of peace which is brotherhood, out of which shall come communions, spiritual especially, which shall increase unto the perfect day and the perfected life, for all living beings.

---

## SOME MISTAKES CORRECTED.

---

Dear brothers and sisters, this is the last time that I shall appear before you in the regular programme of this great gathering. Since coming among you I have been busy, as you know, acquainting myself with your methods of thought and distinctive lines of public discussions on this free platform, and also in discussing in a limited way before select classes some of the philosophies of my own country. It is gratifying to me to find that on fair acquaintance we are not so far apart as probably many of you have been led to suppose. I have yielded to your solicitations, not without much distrust of my ability, to discuss with some freedom differences in religious life and in civilization, which mark our two nations. In my last public address from this platform I was permitted to give you in a brief manner some of the impressions that I had already received respecting your great country, its people and its institutions. I confess to some surprise at myself, in venturing to give those impressions but you drew me on by your kindness and respectful

consideration, and I could not resist the desire to gratify what seemed to me a reasonable proposition. I did not come to this country to propagate the philosophy of my community or the religion of my people. I did not deem it part of my mission to assume that role which distinguishes the missionaries for the most part, which you in your religious zeal, send to my country to enlighten our benighted minds. The spirit in which you have received my words emboldens me to take a further step in the line of removing obstacles in the way of a better understanding. In attempting this task I approach it in the spirit of fraternal love and will endeavor to present my cause in a manner to deserve at least your approval, if you do not fully agree with me.

I do not forget that in a sacred sense I am your guest, and it would pain me, and my people also, if I should inadvertently utter a word to rankle in your thought. I have received so much from you, and am so deeply impressed with the fair mindedness and tolerance of the American people, that I will even venture to correct what I conceive to be grievous mistakes in the public estimate of my people from certain points of view.

In seeking to correct certain mistakes, as I conceive them to be, I may be pardoned if incidentally I can show what India can give in return for your



tolerance and noble consideration on the subjects already discussed in your hearing. I deem it proper to say that I have learned very much thus far in my intercourse with you that will serve me well when I come to report to my own people the lessons of America to India. One of those lessons I cannot refrain from mentioning here. It is this: that good and only good must come from a freer and fuller communion, correspondence and reciprocity, not in philosophy only but in the material factors of civilization, between you and us. I am impelled to predict that we are in the beginning of material, intellectual and spiritual unfoldings and relationships, in the spirit of brotherly recognition and love, which will do more for our mutual good in one decade than a cycle of sectarian missionary propagandism can accomplish.

The first mistake which I desire to notice is the very common one that the Hindus have no history worth considering prior to the Mohammedan invasion which began in the early part of the Eighth century of the Christian era, and ended in conquest one hundred and fifty years later. This mistake has been emphasized recently in certain leading magazines of America by some distinguished writers. What is the truth? The truth is that the history of ancient India is a history, even by the concessions of most eminent European Oriental scholars

of at least 2,000 years before the birth of Christ. But in the Hindu thought our history goes back thousands of years beyond that period.

Western scholarship has given priority in date and in character to the records and monuments of Egypt and of Chaldea. Those records and monuments give simple information and are confined for the most part to the names of kings, the accounts of war and dynasties, and the builders of pyramids. These are interesting to scholars, but shed uncertain light, and little of that, on human progress and civilization. The contrary is true in relation to Hindu history. It does not abound in the records of thrones, of wars, and the incidents of conquests, but are connected recitals of the advancement and successions of civilizations, the progress of the human mind, and the sacred permanency of religious thought and devotion. There are many periods in this history, carrying us back into remotest ages, not inscribed on stones or papyrus, but abounding in hymns that embalm the religious thought and aspirations of the people, and in profound works and systems of philosophy, reflecting each era of civilization. This history to which I refer was not committed to stone or to writing of any kind, but was transmitted with particularity and exactness from generation to generation, from century to century, by oral teachings and repetition. I grant you that

it is difficult to consider this fact,<sup>5</sup> but it stands indisputable, and since the scholars of the Western world have entered upon the systematic study of our history and our literature, they stand confessing this fact with expressions of wonder and amazement. You will see, therefore, without enlargement upon a matter too vast to enter upon that the mistake to which I have referred is a serious one and reflects little honor upon those who persist in it. The character of this mistake may be further seen when you consider the antiquity of the written history of Hindu progress, literature, religion and civilization. It is conceded by some learned scholars, such as Prof. Max Muller, Prof. Weber and Prof. Whitney not to mention others that the Vedic hymns of India date from 1500 to 2000 before Christ, whilst the distinguished doctor, Martin Haug, gives credit for the earliest of these sublime productions to remoter date. It is true that this mistake is pardonable, when we consider that it is only within the memory of the present generation that the scholarship of western civilization has been able with systematic ability to trace their history with exactness of method.

I have spoken of the transmission of historical events from generation to generation by oral tradition from memory to memory, through many centuries before history began to be written in the Sanskrit language the oldest language in the sisterhood of languages. On this point I beg to quote a single para-

graph from a lecture delivered by Prof. Muller before the University of Glasgow in 1892. He says: "To those who are not acquainted with the powers of the human memory when well disciplined or rather when not systematically ruined as ours have been, it may seem almost incredible that so much of the ancient traditional literature should have been composed, and should have survived during so many centuries before it was finally consigned to writing. Still, we have got so far (and I beg to call your attention to this remarkable concession) that everybody now admits that the poets of the Veda did not write there hymns, and that Zoroaster did not leave any written documents. The truth is that there is no equivalent word for writing or to write in the Vedas."

But my American brothers and sisters, the argument for the more ancient history of India than the date of the Vedas, that is to say the committal of the Vedic hymns to writing which is conceded to have been done two thousand years before the birth of Christ, will be found in the study and comprehension of the Vedas themselves. In their composition in the fullness of expression, in the sublimity of thought, in the perfection of imaginary, and in the simplicity of detail, they show a lineage and point to evolutions, gradations and acquired perfections, that imply untold centuries of human development in

thought, in speech, in art, in religion, in philosophy and in all the considerable factors of great, but unrecorded civilizations. Such monuments of learning, both subtle and simple, suggesting a knowledge of nature and of man which only centuries upon centuries of growth can answer for, cannot be considered as modern, even as similar monuments of Egypt, of Greece, or of the Hebrew nation, but must antedate them all and in a sense which will yet be appreciated, prove to be their motherhood. In closing this part of my utterance to you, I will quote one more passage from the same distinguished authority that I have already named Prof. Max Muller says "If I were to look over the whole world to find out the country most richly endowed with all the wealth power and beauty that nature can bestow—in some parts a very paradise on earth—I should point to India. If I were asked under what sky the human mind has most fully developed some of the choicest gifts, has most deeply pondered on the greatest problem of life, and has found solutions of some of them which well deserve the attention even of those who have studied Plato and Kant—I should point to India. And if I were to ask myself from what literature we, here in Europe, we who have been nurtured almost exclusively on the thoughts of Greeks and Romans, and of one Semitic race, the Jewish, may draw that corrective which is most wanted in order to make our inner life more perfect, more compre-

hensive, more universal, in fact more truly human, a life, not for this life only, but a transfigured and eternal life—again I should point to India.”

The second mistake which I desire to correct relates to the origin and purpose, and supposed sacred character of the caste system prevailing in India. Those of you who have honored me by attending my private lessons at this place on the philosophies of India, need not be told that I set up no defence of the cast institution as it obtains there. The popular explanation of this system accepted by the people of the Western world I will give in this way. The four great divisions of caste are named the Brahmin, the Kshatriya the Vaishya and the Shudra, and their origin and meaning in this view are these. The Brahmin sprang from the head of the God, and represents exclusive privilege of intellectual progress and learning, including priestly functions and religious superiority constituting therefore, an exclusive monopoly of right, privilege and enjoyment of intellectual development and religious cult

The Kshatriya sprang from the arms of the God and represents the soldier element which stands for the defence of material and national rights, but without the privileges pertaining to the Brahmin.

The Vaishya or third class sprang, in this View of caste, from the loins of the God, representing

wealth, commerce, bussiness and the activities and monopolies of trade and industries, with still more limited privileges and rights pertaining to the classes above, namely the Brahmin and the Kshatriya. The fourth, or Shudra caste, sprang from the feet of the God, representing servitude and all menial pursuits and labors, with still more restricted rights and privileges, yet with one larger privilege, which pertains to the condition which the origination of this caste implies, namely, abject servitude. As a compensation for the loss of privilege and the denial of certain rights pertaining to knowledge and development, the myriads composing this class are permitted to travel in their own country without let or hindrance, but under the bond of servitude, being the servant class of all the rest. This is the common interpretation and explanation of the caste system briefly stated, given by your writers. But it is not our understanding, nor a fair statement of the truth. What then is that truth ?

In the first place, the ancient Vedas give no record of such an institution as caste, and therefore, it is not in any view an integral part of our ancient religion, or of our philosophy. How then did it come to be instituted ?

Whatever authority may be traced to the Vedic writings on this subject will be found to be the result of innovations, without any more authority or sanc-

tion than that which pride and priestly arrogance can give to perpetuate themselves, contrary to the ancient spirit and the true doctrine which inspire and underlie the universal religion, which recognizes a common fatherhood, and a universal brotherhood, with equal privileges and possibilities. It would weary you if I should attempt the history of this innovation and the origin of the sanctions which may be found in later Puranic writings. My object is simply to stimulate in you the spirit of independent and impartial investigation, well knowing that you will find that my statement is true, and that the institution, shorn of its sentimental incidents, is not an unyielding or cast iron factor in our civilization found in that authority which we bow to with religious awe and obedience. In truth, it has come to be considered more as a social institution rather than one sanctioned by religious authority. From this point of view it may be conceded to possess certain advantages which minimize the restrictions of the social order, which restrictions will melt and disappear as education advances to universal sway. Under another name, if my observations are not at fault, a system of equal rigor and more marked distinction is forcing its way even in this free land of yours, born also of the same motherhood of pride, monopoly, and the centralization of wealth and power. For I find even here great social distinctions, and even religious exclusiveness, lifting their banners



and building their walls with a zeal and a pertinacity of purpose and visible results, that are almost equal to the observable decay of the system as it is popularly believed to exist, in India. I will conclude my observations on this point by quoting a paragraph or two from a very high authority in Her Majesty's India Civil Service and an Honorary Secretary to the Royal Society—Mr. Robert Needham Cust:\*

“How has society dealt with caste? I can only give an opinion based upon experience acquired in a solitary life among the people of Upper India for weeks and months together without any European companion. I never found caste an obstacle to social intercourse, nor did the subject ever press itself forward, and yet the population of the villages and towns visited each day, differed considerably. Few villages were absolutely without Mahomedan, none without men of the lowest caste, and in the thronging of an Indian crowd there must be indiscriminate contact. In my establishment there was the Brahmin, with whom I transacted ordinary business, the Rajput, who carried my messages, the Khatri and Kayastha, who engrossed my orders. Mahomedan and Hindu sat upon the floor working side by side, in constant contact, and handed papers from one to the other; and, if the half caste Christian sat at a table to write English letters, it was only be-

---

\*“Pictures of Indian Life,” R. N. Cust Scribner & Co.

cause the method of English correspondence required this distinction. My own tent was daily thronged by men of all castes and positions in life, and my visits to the male apartments of the notables was considered an honor, and yet of all outcastes the European is the worst, as he asserts his right to eat both beef and pork. Thus, professors of different castes mingle in social life without any unpleasant friction: each man respects his neighbor; he has no wish, indeed, to intermarry with the family of his neighbor, or share the cup and platter of his neighbor, but he does not consider himself in the least superior or inferior."

In one sense, and in one sense only, caste may be said to be religious. All that remains to the non-Mahomedan population of the religious idea and instinct, has centuries ago shrunk into the notion of caste, just as in Europe in the Middle Ages, all that to many men remained of religion, was a keen sense of personal honor. Now, both caste and honor restrain a man's actions from what is contrary to the rules of brotherhood, is dishonorable, and often from crime, in a way, in which nothing else will restrain them, and in that sense caste and honor may be said to be religious sanctions, but in no other. No wise legislator would venture to do aught to weaken such sanctions, the existence of which marks a certain progress in civilization, until other higher sanctions have been substituted.

With all my recollections of valued friends left behind me in India, whose features live in memory and whose portraits in some cases decorate my walls it is amazing to me to hear on my return to England that this good, easy going people, amiable and ignorant, tolerant and docile, accomodating and affectionate, is, in the opinion of wise and good men, "enslaved by a custom which annihilates fellow feeling and eats out human sympathy, and makes one portion of the community slaves to the other." I could multiply quotations of this kind, but it is not my object to aggravate this difficulty, but rather to compose it. I cannot see, that caste is an evil of the kind and degree, which it is imagined by many good men to be. In an exaggerated and self-asserting form it would certainly be an evil under a Hindu system of government of the stiff and intolerant forms of modern religious creeds, but tolerance has ever been of the essence of the Hindu system, and in British India the claws of caste have been cut by a strong and impartial government, and the social pressure of a population made up of various elements which would not submit to oppression. I remark that in Europe classes lie in strata horizontally, and that in India the separation is by verticle fissures. I have known men of good caste and social position as gentlemen, who were not ashamed to have in their families near relations,

in the grade of manial or cock. Now, such a state of affairs would be impossible in Europe, and marks the enormous divergence of social customs''

The next mistake that I must refer to concerns the women of my country. This mistake is manysided and time will not permit me to consider it in detail. In a general way it may be stated, thus:

The women of India, from time immemorial, have been and are, the abject slaves of their husbands, without rights, without privileges, without education, without authority, and even ( as I have heard said ) without souls, except perhaps as they may blindly serve the whims, the behests and the lusts of their masters. To all this statement and to every particular definition that may be given to it, I am proud and honored to interpose a downright denial. I do not mean by this that woman's place and work in India are the same as I am led to believe as are found in this country: whether lower or higher or equal, in a genuine sense, I will not attempt to decide. In the Vedic times, as may be learned from the numerous hymns, many of them composed by women, a pleasing picture of woman's estate may be seen. In that early age the father of the family was the priest, and his home was the temple. The Sacred flame was kindled in every house and the hymns were chanted with simplicity and devotion by the entire family. When sacrifices were

to be offered, religious devotions performed, prominent in that picture is seen the woman who is the wife and the mother. In those early days and down through all mutations, and at the present time, the most worthy households from every point of view are those households in which grand parents, parents, sons and their wives dwell together in unity and in the bonds of love, each doing his and her part for the comfort instruction and happiness of the home. not alone in domestic industries, but in the rights and ceremonies of religious devotion I will give you a few of the prayers of the Rigveda pertaining to this exalted condition.

“Oh, ye gods, the married couple who prepare oblations together, who purify the Soma juice and mix it with milk—may they obtain food for their eating and come united to the sacrifices (ligionfor service ), may they never have to go in quest foods. They worship you with the best offerings, blest with youthful and adolescent offspring, they acquire wealth and they both attain to a mature age Then god themselves covet the worship of such a couple who neglect not religious sacrifices and duties and who offer grateful services of worship and gifts to gods, and who embrace each other to continue their race, and they worship their gods.”

Again a beautiful picture is that of highly educated women who, themselves, Rishis(sages), because

of their learning and devotion, compose hundreds of hymns and perform the sacred services, the same as men. In those days before my country knew the demands, the tendencies and the restrictions of other civilization against women, there were no restrictions of an unwholesome character, nor were they kept in seclusion, denied education, or excluded from the highest positions in society. Wives and brides were veiled often, not through any law or custom imposed upon them, but in obedience to the modest impulses of their own heart, but they had unrestricted liberty to go and come within the limits of self-imposed propriety. Prominent among the names of distinguished dames whose examples and wise precepts are embalmed in the sweet and holy measures of many hymns composed by themselves, is that of Vishava-  
vara, the interpretation of which name is itself a commemoration of her virtues and learning—which is, “the elect lady.” Whoever will study the composition of this exalted woman will be inspired to know and to keep inviolable the mutual relations of husband and wife. Indeed, in the ages to which I refer, the wife was the queen of the household, whose word was law to the members of the same, and who, like the mothers of this age, would arouse the household at early dawn and set everyone from the oldest to the youngest to his and her proper task, and whose example was the bright light to which all eyes

were turned. I do not mean to say that all women and maidens in that age, any more than now, were virtuous and true. My object is to truthfully set forth the foundation facts, and the dominant grace and purpose. Contemporaneous testimony before the days of Christ, but also now extant, of biggest authority, prove that the women of India were noticeable for their modesty and chastity. Megasthenes, the Greek ambassador, three hundred years before Christ, found India two reasons for great admiration. The first was the absence of slavery, and the second the chastity of the women. In a previous lecture, and to my classes also, I have given you in some detail a true account of the marriage customs of my people, and the constitution of the Hindu family, and will not, therefore, at this time enlarge in this direction. But I will describe to you in a short way the sacred ceremony of marriage, leaving out the mere secular, social and incidental exercises. Among the hymns recited at that ceremony are such as these.

“May the husband and the wife be well united,” turning to the bride the priest would say, “Oh, maiden, the graceful sun had fastened thee with ties of maidenhood” (which means that up to this time she had lived free from the carnal knowledge of any man. “We release thee now of these ties, we place thee with thy husband in a place which is the home of truth and the abode of righteous action.”

These words and all others are repeated by the parents who give away their loved daughter to the husband. The hymn continues,—“Go to your husband’s house and be its mistress, be the mistress of all, and exercise your authority over all in that house, let children be born unto thee and blessings attend thee, perform the duties of thy household with care, unite thy person with the person of this thy husband, and exercise thy authority in this thy house until old age.”

Addressing the married couple, the priest and parents continue,—“Oh, bridegroom and bride, do you remain here together, do not be separated, enjoy all proper food, be content to remain in your own home, and find and enjoy happiness in the company of your children and your grandchildren.”

The bride and bridegroom offer this prayer — “May the Lord of Creation bestow on us children and may Aryman (the law of life-preservation) keep us united till old age.” To the bride is then said, “Oh bride, enter with auspicious signs the home of thy husband, let thine eye be free from anger, minister to the happiness of thy husband, and be kind to all living beings, cultivate a cheerful mind and may thy beauty be bright; be the mother of heroic sons, and be devoted to the gods. May thou have influence over thy father-in-law, and over thy mother-in-law,



and be as a queen over thy sister-in-law and thy brother-in-law." And lastly, the bridegroom and the bride say to each other—in the full realization of the new relations in which they stand, henceforth to proceed with one heart, and one mind,—“may all the gods unite our hearts, may the god of maternity and the spirit of proper instruction and goodness, of wise and pure speech, unite us together.”

This, my American brothers and sisters, in brief, is the marriage ceremony of the Hindus. It is longer and more tedious perhaps than your short, and as it would seem, not over-binding ceremony which I have witnessed since coming to your country and also on this platform. In your ceremony words pass between the bride and bridegroom, some of which words, as you have seen, are conspicuous for their absence in the “Heathen” ceremony which I have declared to you. Your priest would say to the man—“Wilt thou have this woman to be thy wedded wife, wilt thou love, honor and keep her in sickness and in health, and forsaking all others cling only unto her so long as life shall last.” And to the bride he will say—“Wilt thou take this man to be thy wedded husband, wilt thou love, honor and obey him and forsaking all others cling only to him so long as life shall last.” To these propositions the man and the woman are expected to answer each, “I will.” But, if what I hear from you be the truth,

this is said in many instances, with a large reservation. The absence of the pledge to obey the husband in the religious marriage ceremony of my people, ought of itself, to save us from certain strictures and unjust criticisms, and our women from consignment in your belief to a state of abject chattelhood, degradation, and groveling subserviency to their husbands. I hope you will understand that I do not assume to sit in judgment upon your institutions, nor for one moment to institute invidious comparisons. As a Hindu I honor womanhood throughout the world and bow in proper worship to those sacred qualities which constitute wife-hood and motherhood. The greatest of all honors are those that cluster about the name and character of mother and wife.

Oh, my brothers and sisters, whatever privileges and rights may seem to be denied the women of your country, and whatever duties of a more public nature may seem to demand their attention and their care, let nothing be said or done or thought, that shall detract from the crown of motherhood and wifeness, the glorious lustre that is found only there. But this I must say, that no Hindu women in all the history—the sorrowful, sad and changing history of my race,—has ever sought relief from the holy vows of marriage in divorce. We, of India, do not forget that we are under the Govern-

ment of a woman—her Gracious Majesty, Victoria, Queen, of Great Britain and Ireland and Empress of India, whose birthday and coronation day are national holidays, and who by our people is more frequently called, not the Empress of India, but the mother.

I will say that the designation of wife in India, of the Hindu wife, is higher and grander than that of Empress. She is called Devi, or Goddess.

If you can reconcile these facts and deductions to the mistaken notions which you have received, from whatever sources, respecting the condition of women of my country, it is your task, to which I cheerfully leave you.

In the lectures which I have had the honor to deliver to you in the class room, I have spoken largely concerning the early marriages among my people, and will not at this time do more than state the reasons thereof. The first reason is that the giving in marriage to the early age to which reference is made, does not imply in any case the consummation of marriage. The ceremony that I have given you, which is the real marriage, is performed among the Jains at the proper age of maturity, and the wife proceeds at once to her husband's home, and this was the custom in the earlier ages, before

India became the coveted land of the invader. The second reason is that the early betrothal was necessary in the Hindu thought as a measure of protection, which includes time and the duty of education on the part of the young persons thus betrothed. If, between the time of the betrothal and the marriage ceremony, the betrothed shall die, the betrothed wife may be married to another. The protection to which I have referred, which this early betrothal gives to the girl of India can be as well understood by you as if I were to go into a detailed statement, for among the perquisites and spoils of the invader of all times must be reckoned, not alone lootings of perishable possessions of the conquered, but the possession and ravishment of unprotected women. Indeed, this measure of protection has not always proved adequate any more than your laws of prohibition of the liquor traffic have always, or may ever really, prohibit. A third reason may be given that womanhood is reached in our country at an earlier age than in your own.

Another mistake that I must briefly notice is the prevalent misconception of the moral status of the Hindu people at large. I cannot go into this subject further than to affirm that the basis of morality, its laws and rules, differ in no essential respect from those that obtain throughout the universal world. The rites of our religion, the relationships obtaining

throughout the whole social structure, both as to private and public conduct, answer for the highest moral character. Justice, truth, purity, are words meaningful to every Hindu, sacred to his thought, not only parts of his speech, but essential elements in his daily devotions.

“Thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not covet, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not lie,” are commandments with us as with you, and thou shalt practice virtue, good will, right conduct, not toward men only, but toward all living beings, are also parts of our moral code, which no Hindu can forget or deny without bringing down upon him corresponding evils and retribution. These are the straight lines in which we are instructed and required to walk. If men grow lame and weak and sometimes fall by the way in India, as in America, we know the source of that weakness and that failure, and should bequeath our commiseration and helpful brotherly pity. But this must be said in justice to my people, that the statistics of crime in India, as ascertained by Government scrutiny, are but one-fourth in extent of those of England itself.

In concluding this part of my subject, I will refer you to the fact which with you is familiar, that what is said sometimes of the moral status of the Hindus, which is the outward expression of the moral law

which they adopt, is also said of you, who are spiritualists, by some of your ill-informed Christian brothers. The same argument that you present in meeting the objection I also can and do adopt as my answer, since if I should seek to formulate answer it could no be more pertinent or more just. I find that answer in a book which I have considered for the first time on these grounds, and the author of which, well known to you, for he is on this platform, is not only my brother, but my friend, whom I have learned not only to admire but to love. The book is entitled "Angel's Visits to my Farm in Florida" The author's name is "Golden Light," but the pronounciation would be different. In that book I find this paragraph which I will now read, and in the translation of it to my own people. I should substitute for Spiritualism, Hinduism. The author says to the objector to Spiritualism as I would say to the objector to Hinduism.

"I suggested that perhaps public opinion in many things was based on misconception, and ignorance of the real truth, principles and facts underlying and constituting the philosophy of spiritualism It is of the very first importance, in the first estimate of this philosophy and its adherents and advocates, to know whether or not its principles and teachings are in themselves moral, judged by the highest standards. Is the morality of this philosophy different from that

which all pure minds accept, whether it be called Christian or Jewish, Mohammedan or Hindu, Greek or Roman ?

Are there several codes ?

Is the essence of morality one everywhere or various, as men conceive it ?

Is morality a creature of rules and regulations and human formulations ?

Is it not rather the soul of right, or the conscience of right, implanted or breathed into humanity and into the universe by the Infinite Creator ?

What is moral law ?

Who shall define it ?

What authority shall interpret it ?

It goes without saying that whatever it is and wherever it is, it is obligatory on all. But where will you search for it outside of yourself.

Is it something independent of your consciousness, lying somewhere hidden, waiting to be discovered ?

If it is not found within you, where shall you look for it ?

Fichte, the German philosopher, says that "the formal law of morals," is this:

“Always act in conformity with your convictions of duty (obey your conscience).”

“This rule includes two others, first, try to understand clearly what is your duty in every matter then, when you are convinced what your duty is, do it, for the sole reason that you are sure that it is your duty.”

Spiritualism, as I understand it, adopts and emphasizes this law, even as Jesus did—in his sermon on the mount—and as all good Christians do when they truly interpret him.

The criterion of morality is the conscience, not another man's but your own.

I do not mean that one should not take counsel of other men's consciences in arriving at right conclusions, but I assert the very contrary, that one should do so. Not for the purpose of lessening the sense of responsibility, but for the confirmation of truth and right.

This is the common practice of mankind, and so is that certain things are settled, because universal, or concrete conscience of mankind through ages, has made them so.”

Having thus noticed some of the mistakes prevalent in respect to my people and our religion, history and



morality, and conscious of doing scant justice to each matter, and also conscious of the purpose to be just and true, I must now close this lecture by expressing, as I may, my conception of the future that awaits us in this world, where the thought and the conduct of men make and mar their future. To me the outgrowth of religions, civilizations and Governments, are the expressions of human progress and development from one motherhood of law, of nature, of man. We of India do not arrogate to ourselves superiority and authority, noting as we do along the ages, the rise, decline and fall, of empires and civilizations, to lecture you for your faults or to condemn you for your failures. No. We in the old home of the great mother of the nations, the civilizations, the philosophies and the religions of the wide world, would extend to you the mothers' blessing, the home greeting, and express, not the hope only, but the firm belief, that when you shall have compassed all seas and all lands, and all methods, and have exhausted all resources and discoveries in literature, in art, in the sciences, and in the worship of God, you will by degrees, by slow, perhaps painful but sure progress, turn your faces and direct your steps toward the old home, the old mother, and your brothers and sisters in India, the blessed. There you will find the old hospitality, the old sweet life, and the dear old mother unchanged in her devotion and in her love, capable

of recognizing you all, and in her ample lap you shall nestle, as your progenitors did in the earlier times, amid the caressings and benedictions of love—love—love power, better than science, better than art, better than wealth because it is love which answers for the usefulness and right work of all these, and “which passeth understanding.”

Trade relations between the United States of America and India.—On behalf of my people especially the Bombay Marine Association, a society for the encouragement of commercial, industrial education in India, I offer you my heartfelt thanks, for extending to use this indication from the Philadelphia Commercial Museum to participate in the deliberations of this Congress. The gentlemen who represent the Philadelphia Commercial Museum had indeed no authority, as King or Emperor, to command us to attend, but they recognize the fact that nations should once and for all stop that barbarous practice of war for deciding political problems of the day. Not only that but that they should also stop the commercial warfare that is rampant in civilized countries.

One of the ablest speakers of the United States said: “In commerce there should be friendly rivalry, but no war.” We recognize the principle that international conference in matters commercial has been a dream of philosophers, and it is highly creditable to

the genius of Director W. P. Wilson, of the Philadelphia Commercial Museum, that that has been realized. It is an event unique in the history of the world, and the Philadelphians justly deserve the credit of having consummated it.

During a residence of nearly six years in this country through the hospitable facilities afforded to me on every hand, I have learned much about the commercial and industrial institutions of this country, and it is therefore a great pleasure for me to address you on the subject of trade relations between the United States and India.

India has been the Klondike of the world from the beginning of its history, from the time of the Greeks and Mongolians they all had their day in India, and the last and latest are the British people your cousins on the other side of the Atlantic.

In International commerce India also is an ancient country. Long before the Christian era the commodities of India, its manufactured articles made by hand works of art, furniture and other things were known in the countries on the shore of the Mediterranean.

International commerce, as it is understood to day, is only a recent thing, although you may call it

a baby, still it is a China baby. We recognize the fact also that no nation can claim to be accounted as one of the important factors in the elevation of humanity unless it has its due share in international commerce.

Now so far as India is concerned, I do not wish to go into the political, or the geographical or merely economical and domestic conditions of the country. I want to present before you a few facts that may be of some importance, especially to the manufacturers in this country, therefore, I shall give you some idea as to the export and import, especially of the imports of India.

Politically, India may be divided into two parts, British India and India under the rule of native Princes under the suzerainty of the Crown of England. Commercially, there is only one India, and that is "India" without distinguishing it as British or native India.

The imports of India are very large, indeed. Every year its imports of foreign merchandise increase. Last year \$270,000,000 and \$310,000,000 worth of goods and exports \$350,000,000 and \$395,000,000 of commodities. The major part of home imports are manufactured goods of all countries of the world,

who pour forth their commodities and merchandise into India, Great Britain stands the first sending from \$155,000,000 to \$170,000,000 worth of merchandise every year. Next comes Germany, whose exports have increased from \$500,060,000 in '93 to \$978,000,000.

This is only a preliminary idea about the imports into India of foreign merchandise. What we are specially interested in is a share of the United States in that trade.

Your chairman has told you that the trade with the United States is not very large. When I compare it with a large share taken by Great Britain, it seems very small indeed. I do not intend to go into the details of the various articles of manufacture of the United States that we receive in India, but still the manufacturer necessarily wants certain details that will give him that information that will be useful to him for future guidance.

In the first place then, so far as the raw products are concerned, it is very little. The possibilities of the future are great. Wheat and cotton are the important staple articles coming from America. We also produce the same articles, but the cotton market being finer than that produced in India, and on account

of this very reason as we are not able to produce certain kinds of yarn in our mills the cotton mills in India, it will be to the advantage to the United States if they only made arrangement for shipping cotton to India.

The most important things that we receive from the United States are in the manufactured line. For instance, so far as the manufacture of articles in India is concerned, there is to some extent going on, and has been going on for a certain numbers of years, a trade between India and America. We receive from this country hardware, cutlery, sewing machines, water-mills, sugar-mills, oil-presses, and so on, but the share of America, when compared with the shares allotted to the other countries of the civilized world, is very small. I will not go into the details as to these things, as I told you before, but I will only give you an idea, for instance, so far as water-mills, sugar-mills, oil-presses, and such miscellaneous machines are concerned. We have imported into the United States, in the year 1897—98, about \$40,004,000 worth, and the share of America was only \$30,000 worth.

With the superior manufacturing skill and up-to-date machine and machinery of the Americans, they ought to have a better share—I mean to say they would have a better share, provided proper methods are adopted.

Now there are so many details, which details would be appreciated by manufacturers who want to deal with merchants in India, and these things can be better elucidated in a personal conversation. I would only mention a few lines of the manufactured articles that would be proper to introduce into India.

First, agricultural implements. Now, while we receive a large quantity from other countries in India America only sent us about 16,000 worth last year. What is the reason? There are reasons and these reasons I shall state at the end of this address. Then there is a possibility of introducing brass manufactures into India, also next comes brooms and brushes bicycles, colluloid articles, chemicals, drugs, medicines clocks and watches, articles of copper, cotton manufactures, and just here I will remark that from 97 to 99 per cent of the textile goods imported into India, 97 to 99 per cent was furnished by Great Britain, and we shall continue to buy from Great Britain all such goods.

Now we have a reason for that. If you can comply with the condition and requirement in India markets, you can also have a share. In the first place, the mill owners of this country know nothing—I should say absolutely nothing—of the kind of goods that would have a sale in India. I do not like to make personal remarks, but a short time ago I had

the pleasure of visiting a well-known textile goods firm—I say I had the honor of visiting the store in the city of New York, and the head of the export department showed me samples in textile, lines of thread, especially, and he told me that those things were very good for ladies' dresses.

Now if that gentleman had known even a very little about the manners and customs and habits of our people, he would also have known that those goods could not have been sold in India. Such prints are not used in India. In fact, the manufacturers of Great Britain make a speciality in this line, some of them manufacture entirely for India and the surrounding country. That is the very secret of success of the British manufacturer.

Next comes other articles like the fibres, and they belong to the textile line. Then also we can create a demand in India for the American dried fruit: also for glass, and glassware, for graphite in the raw condition. Still only the great country that produced this mineral, and we want it, and we can get it from an island only a few hours journey from our country, but in the manufacture of graphite, certainly that ought to be an opening in India. Of course there is always an opening in civilized countries for gunpowder but we advise you not to send it, we do not like it, we do not like the policy that is heralded by gunpowder. There is an opening for the manufacture of



leather, of boots and shoes. Also India rubber, and its manufacture knows something about the reasons of that country, and habits of the people. Printers' ink is largely used in India, and as we have so many printing presses, and also lithographic presses, there would be a great demand for it, that is if the manufacturers of American ink would send something cheap and that would conform to the standard of the people. Instruments in America for scientific purposes are also demanded in India

The most important article that can be introduced into India is iron and steel. The manufacturers of Belgium and Great Britain are the great competitors in matters of this kind on account of price. They are more favorable than manufacturers in other parts of the world, and that is the reason why we have up to this present time preferred to buy from them, but if the proper conditions, similar conditions are conformed to here, I do not see any reason why Americans should not open a large trade in our country

I see that merchants in all parts of the world always buy in the home market, and there is no sentiment at all about it so far as trade is concerned.

Then there are articles made of iron; like nails and spikes, wire nails screws, nuts and bolts, etc., and all have a ready market in India. Musical instruments also have a demand, but here I should remark that

if you are sending beautiful instruments to India the manufacturers must understand something about the requirements as to music, as our music differs from your music. Our music is not merely tom, tom, tom, it is scientific, but the manufacturer must know something about the notice.

Of course I am not here to deliver a lecture on music, or on the science of acoustics, but you will only appreciate this much, that organs are more in demand in India than pianos. The german and French organs are received in large quantities, they are cheap and they are suitable to the people, they are portable and you see that the conditions are such before the goods in that line are introduced into India.

Now there are certain suggestions, and I will offer two or three so that there may be an opening trade between the United States and India and these suggestions are on the line of removing the difficulties that are at present in the way.

In the first place you have no sample house in India where American goods can be exhibited and shown to the people. You cannot expect the people in foreign countries will buy your goods unless they actually see them and have an opportunity of comparing them with similar goods of other countries.

Now if you are willing to open these sample houses; that is the best thing you can do. Appoint

a special agent, an agent on whom you can rely and in whom you can place trust, and they will do the work for you.

The next suggestion is that your policy of sending illustrated catalogues of prices of American firms here has no use in India. The majority of them are printed in the English language, which the people do not know anything about, nothing but a waste of your labor and time.

Last of all you must compete with foreign manufacturers in prices and in terms. I will not say anything to you about prices, about that you can do what suits yourselves. As to the terms I can say that foreign merchants are able to give us better terms than you do.

I will just read a few lines of a letter from a foreign merchant,—an Eastern merchant. He said “As a matter of fact, the great bulk of American manufacturers are extremely ignorant of the wants of the foreign market and proper means of advancing and increasing the foreign trade.”

The idea has become prevalent among the manufacturers of the United States that no commercial integrity exists outside of their own countries. This idea is an erroneous one, but it prevails in New York, but such is not the case on the other side of the world.

You must not think that all of the honesty is one side of the world, there is as much on the other side of the world as there is on this.

He also said it was absolutely unsafe to extend a line of credit to foreign dealers. As a matter of fact English and German firms and other firms, dealers, extend the credit to other nations but admitted it is harder to handle trade there than it is when it is nearer home. So long as a manufacturer has sufficient trade at home to keep his work in operation he had better stay at home but when he does go abroad into the world's market, he must make up his mind to meet the competition in prices as well as the terms. Until he makes up his mind to do what he had better not waste his time trying to enter the foreign market.



## ANOTHER INDIAN RELIGION.

In pursuance of the liberal policy outlined at the inception of Mind, we present as the leading article of this number a contribution from the pen of Virchand R. Gandhi, of Bombay. Mr. Gandhi is eminent in his own land as a scholar and teacher, and has achieved by his lectures in this country, since the year of the World's Fair a wide reputation for sincerity, candor, and ability in the presentation of the esoteric truths of Jainism. The number of adherents of this Eastern religion is nearly five millions, and many of its features have commanded it to thoughtful minds among all races.

Part of the mission of our contributor is to correct the numerous misconceptions regarding Oriental philosophy in general and Jainism in particular that have gained currency in Western thought and literature. For instance, we are repeatedly told that it is customary for certain fanatics deliberately to seek death by allowing the car of Juggen-nath to run over them. "There is a certain heavy stone car," said Mr. Gandhi in a recent lecture, "that once every twelve years is dragged by hundreds of people from the river to the Temple. A

vast multitude watches the ceremony. Sometimes there is an accident and a few parsons are run over, but to say that they 'throw' themselves under the wheels is ridiculous "

This teacher's article on the psychology and philosophy of the Jains is an inspiring example of the subtle workings of the Indo-philosophic mind. and our readers are to be congratulated on getting an exposition of this ancient religion from an authentic source

—:o —

Mr. V. R. Gandhi B. A., of the University of Bombay, India, is a brilliant lawyer of unusual attainments, and is master of fourteen languages including English. He is the Honorary Secretary of the Jain Association of India, and enjoys the distinction of being the only gentleman from India, who was elected by the people at home as Delegate to the Parliament of Religions held in Chicago in September, 1893, where he most eloquently represented the 5,000,000 of Jains of India. Mr. Gandhi has remained in this country to study our customs, politics, educational and industrial institutions. He is a man of strong personality, filled with enthusiasm, sincere and earnest in purpose, a man of unflinching moral courage and the soul of honor. All this and more impresses you as you look into his calm, piercing eyes, and listen to his animated discussions on the customs and religions of India. But it is when

dwelling upon the selfishness and injustice of mankind and the miseries of the ignorant poor that Mr. Gandhi grows most eloquent, and his soul shines through his eyes as he warms with his subject.

No one should fail to hear this eloquent native from India whenever opportunity occurs; one can gain more knowledge and truth in one evening than from any other source. He will be able to correct many prevalent and erroneous impressions concerning India and its people. He will answer all questions after the lecture that any one from the audience may choose to ask. There can not be too much said in praise of this grand and noble man who daily lives up to the principles of purity which he advocates. Mr. Gandhi has already spoken in this country before clubs, lyceums, literary and church societies, theosophical branches and spiritual associations, and has conducted large classes in Eastern Occultism. He has everywhere been accorded a warm reception and shown the highest appreciation.—*Editor's Bureau*

---

The Broad and Catholic Spirit of this Grand Hindu May Be Best Understood By the Following Extract From His Lecture, Delivered At Cassadaga, N. Y., Aug 12, 1894, Where he was Engaged For Several Lectures and Classes.

When missionaries sent from this continent to our country, and to our people, shall have learned that we are children of the same family, that we inherit the same perceptions, the same rights, the same inspirations and the same relations to the Infinite, and seek to fraternise with us on that plane and with this recognition—then, and then only, antagonism and injustice will cease, and the bonds of common brotherhood will unite us in a mutual recognition of reasons for a perfect fellowship. \*\*What is that Christ in whose name you propose to conquer the world? Is there a Christ of oppression; is there a Christ of injustice; is there a Christ of misinterpretation; is there a Christ of denial of all rights; is there a Christ of destruction of all holy aims and humane immemorial institutions; is there a Christ of injustice and exorbitant taxation for the support of a government, foreign to our knowledge our thought, our religion and our consent? Who of these Christs has inscribed his name on the banner of your conquests? If you seek to conquer us under such banners, and in the name of such Christs, we refuse to be conquered. But if you come to us in the name and in the spirit of the Christ of education, of brother-



hood, universal love, or in the name of that Christ, who, in the valley of the Ganges, and on the shores of the sea of Tiberius, taught and said, "A new commandment give I unto you, that ye love one another" then I say, we will welcome you for him we know, and of him we are not afraid. But all this must be understood in the full freedom of it. We can not recognize a creedal Christ, a limited Christ, an emasculated truth whether it is viewed from an educational or moral and spiritual point of view, but the universal idea, without limit without fetters, free. \* \* We come gladly at your invitation, for another reason. You are the most tolerant and liberal nation in the western world, and tolerance is the first article in the faith of every Hindu, Buddhist or Jainist. No man can point to any instance in the history of my people where any man was ever persecuted for religious opinion's sake. Our very language does not contain an equivalent word for the English word "persecution." We have words in our language, in the ancient Sanskrit, that cover the whole ground of Justice, of purity, of goodness, of love and of all the sweet beatitudes of the soul's attainment, but not one word that means malice, persecution or tyranny for religious opinion's sake.

---

From Rev A. White, of Chicago.

6550, Lafayette Ave, Chicago, Ill.

I consider Mr. Gandhi one of the best equipped of the many scholarly men who represented the various religions

of India in the recent Parliament of Religions. A public lecture given by him in my church was, in my opinion a most scholarly production, both in matter and form, and showed a thorough grasp of Oriental philosophy Mr. Gandhi has a fine command of the English tongue, and is altogether a most interesting man in every way

R. A. WHITE.

— o: —

From Hon E. B Sherman.

*Master in Chancery of the United States, Circuit Courts*

“The Congress of Religions drew to Chicago several of the brightest and most interesting Oriental thinkers and scholars that is has ever been my pleasure to meet, among them is Mr. V R Gandhi, a lawyer of Bombay, India.”

“It has rarely, if ever, been my good fortune to meet a man whose reading and culture have been so wide and varied, and who, withal, has so sweet, sincere and teachable a spirit as Mr. Gandhi.”

—:o:—

From Rev Addison Parker

*Pastor Leading Baptist Church, LaPorte, Ind*

Pastor's Study, La Porte, Ind., Dec. 2, 1893

During the meeting of the parliament of Religions at Chicago. I had the pleasure of listening to Mr. Gandhi's

address upon the "Jains" of India, and also of a brief personal conversation with him. He impressed me as one of the brainiest and most stirring of the representatives of the Far East. I know of no one from whom I would prefer to hear concerning the life and thought of the great people he represents.

ADDISON PARKER.

—:o:—

*Buffalo Courier, Aug. 19, 1894.*

Virchand R. Gandhi, the Jain Hindu of Bombay, has been accorded the greatest ovation ever granted to a speaker at Cassadaga. Saturday afternoon when he stepped forward in his silken robe of royal purple and golden colored turban and sash, the auditorium fairly rang with applause, and when he finished his speech which, was announced as "Some Mistakes Corrected" he was recalled again and again.

—:c —

*Light of Truth, Cincinnati, Aug. 11, 1894.*

Mr. Gandhi is a through student of the Vedic religion of India, thoroughly conversant with the Brahminical tenets and the teachings of Buddha. He illumines them all with the spiritual halo and practical philosophy of his great teacher as well as his own luminous mind.

—:o:—

*Light of Truth, Aug. 1894*

Virchand R. Gandhi, the Jainist, has opened a class for instruction in the ancient religions. The lecture-room is each day crowded to its utmost with brightest minds of the camp eager to hear this wonderful Hindu scholar expound his religious theories

—:o:—

*The Evangelist, New York, Aug. 23, 1894.*

Recently Cassadaga, the trysting place of heterogeneous creeds, has blossomed but with a new attraction, striking to the eye as well as to the mind. This new card is Mr. Virchand Gandhi of Bombay, a gentleman of noble presence, a trained scholar, lawyer versed in Sanskrit lore and in English literature as well. He came to this country by invitation of Dr. Barrows, as a representative of the Jain religion. Mr. Gandhi is an able exponent of all the religions of India.

—:o:—

*The Illustrated Buffalo Express, Aug 12, 1894.*

On saturday afternoon one of the most enthusiastic audiences ever known to the auditorium of Cassadaga listened to "The Message of India to the people of America," by Virchand R. Gandhi, B. A. of Bombay, India, who was elected by a vote of 5,000,00 Jains to represent them at the late world's Congress of Religions in Chicago.

Mr, Gandhi was given a perfect ovation as he stepped forward in his Oriental costume of royal purple silk and yellow turban and sash, and said; "Brothers and sisters of America: I greet you in the name of India and her three millions of sons and daughters. I greet you as brothers and sisters and bring you a message of peace, love, universal brotherhood and fellowship from the aged and well preserved nation of India, which is proud to clasp the hand of the youngest child of the ages. Our country in all confidence place in your lap the key to its achives of ancient philosophy and attainments, because you are in a perfect intellectual condition to appreciate its mystical treasures and religious lore . India has been studied from the outside from a limited point of view and consequently misunderstood,"



## PROCEEDINGS OF THE EAST INDIA ASSOCIATION.

A meeting of the East India Association, held at the Westminster Town Hall on Monday, May 21, 1900 a paper was read by Virchand R. Gandhi, Esq., on "Contribution of Jainism to Philosophy History and Progress." Sir Raymond West occupied the chair. The following among others were present Sir Roland K. Wilson, Bart.; Sir Lepel Griffin, K. C. S. I.; Sir William Rattigan, Q. C.; Hon. J.

D. Rees, C. I. E.; Lieut-Colonel T. Warlike; Mrs. and Miss Arathoon; Mrs. F. Aublet; Mr. H. R. Cook; Mr. W. Coldstream; Mr. B. B. Costin; Mr. Bah Chet; Raizada Eswan Das, Mrs. Delafore; Miss Gawthrop; Miss Hertz, Mr. Shyamaji Khrishnavarma, Mr. Emlyn Lewys; Mr. Sayed Alay Mahomed, I. C. S.; Mr. V. J. Modi; Mr. J. B. Pennington; Mr. H. Prince F. R. G. S.; Mr. Alexander Rogers; Mr. R. P. Roy; Mr. Kanwar Sam; The Misses Snitko; Mr. M. E. Tatham; Mr. W. T. Turton; Miss Webster; Mr. C. W. Whish; Mr. W. Martin Wood. Mr. C. W. Arathoon, Hon. secretary

The Chairman having briefly introduced Mr. Gandhi the paper was read \*

The chairman afterwards said Ladies and gentlemen, this paper will have convinced everybody that the Jains, who have done so much for education in India, and taken so advanced a position in the liberalizing of the studies of that country, are a people whose philosophy and ideas have a claim to our serious consideration. Such a people, with such a class spirit amongst them, could not have been produced unless there were latent in the principles which govern them something raising them above our ordinary plane of everyday thoughts and aspirations. Therefore we must be grateful to the Jains, and must endeavour, if we can, to penetrate into the secret underlying motives of their mental activity. In that we shall be assisted by the paper just

---

\* See this paper elsewhere in this book

read, and, I hope, by further contributions in the same line of study by the distinguished gentleman who has favoured us with the paper to day. It would be beyond my power to go into a minute discussion of the various points brought forward, which are matters only for scholars in a very special line. The most we can do is to take up a point here and there, and make a few observations with a view of suggesting a point for further elucidation, either now or on another occasion, by our learned lecturer. From that standpoint I should like to put forward one or two matters for inquiry. The relation of the Jain philosophy to the early Greek philosophy suggested several questions. Mr. Gandhi has mentioned Thales. Thales, looking out on the surface of creation, thought he detected the active principle of the universe in moisture. He was followed by another distinguished philosopher, who thought that water might be a very active force in nature, but that it could not be brought into activity without something which he could himself feel; and what he felt in his own person as being the central force was air. Then came Diogenes of Appollonia, who carried the speculation a step further, and said there must be something behind the air; there must be a Soul to give it this particular characteristic, and so he imagined *primum mobile*, or first source of being in action, the Soul of the Universe. There are views natural enough in the world of philosophy in its early stages. I should have been pleased if Mr. Gandhi had told us how far the earlier speculations of the Jain

philosophers ran in this course. He takes us somewhat at a bound to the point of the development of all phenomenal existence from central real existence which lies behind, but the distinction is not to my mind quite clearly made out, of the Jain philosophy from the other systems, when he says the Jains or the advocates of the development theory, from which he springs to the notion that their ideal is physical, mental, spiritual, and moral perfection. He goes on to say that the phenomenal is on Jain principle indistinguishable from the real. I should like him to say something about the passage in which he says "First, there is the indefinite cognition as an isolated object or idea." That to me, is rather puzzling, because cognition to my mind means recognising something by its limits. So long as you do not assign to something limits which distinguish it from something else, the process can hardly be called a cognition; it only becomes a cognition in so far as you mark it off by some particular signs, or limits, from other notions. Then we have the phrase "condensation of all differences." I suppose that means a "suppression of differences" If you in your philosophizing, in order to arrive at some comprehensive category, suppress one difference after another, at last you lose all possibility of recognition I take it that "condensation" here means suppression—that you lose yourself if you carry that suppression of particulars and accidents and differences too far. Then the word "diffuseness" occurs. "The analysis



shall not be an absolute "diffuseness." I take it "difussion" is used in the sense of "dispresion," so that the characteristics are so scattered that can no longer recognise what it was you were proposing to deal with. I hope Mr. Gandhi will forgive me for being so critical. People are excusably critical when they know nothing of a subject and want to learn something. I take it that this phrase, "The doctrine of the inexpugnability of the inextricably combined properties and relations" in our everyday dialect means this "A rational necessity under which we are of conceiving certain things as related to other things in particular ways." Another point struck me as being worth a word or two as to law in nature and a law as amongst human beings. Mr. Gandhi, I suppose taking the Jain view says, "A law is not a command, but a formula to which things or beings conform precisely, and without exception under definite relations." This agrees with the view that I thought was to be gathered from the somewhat complicated statement I read a minute or two ago, namely, that things must needs be conceived as having certain relations to one another—that is, some things must. The proper way to state this would be the familiar one, it is not a command but a summary of observations. It comes to this, that law in nature is a statement in a systematic way, of the conditions of the existences of the actual phenomena, the difference between this and the human law being that amongst natural objects it is the obedience which

constitutes the law, whereas amongst human beings it is the law which enforces the obedience, or at least it is that which commands the obedience, which is enforced by a sanction behind it. There was a point which struck me as being extremely interesting. He said, "Clay, stones, etc., as they come fresh from the earth have life." If that is a correct statement, which I do not doubt, of the Jain view, they are trespassing very much on the field of Thales, whose idea was that it was moisture which constituted the life, and the Jain idea appears to be of a universality of life existing under these particular conditions, in which you contrive to expel more or less moisture. I am afraid, however, that I am trespassing upon time which ought to be given to other gentlemen. There are a number of most interesting topics which suggest themselves in connection with this paper, and I hope that Mr Gandhi, when he has leisure, will develop the subject more at length. To compress a statement of the Jain philosophy, and the contributions it has made to the intellectual growth of mankind within the compass of a lecture of half an hour, would be too great an effort for the greatest genius. Therefore I think it no ill complement to Mr Gandhi to say his paper will, in my opinion, admit of a considerable degree of expansion and development with advantage, to the elucidation of the argument, and our further comprehension of the somewhat abstruse subject with which he has dealt.

Sir Lepel Griffin would be glad if the lecturer would enlighten them on the most important questions connected with the subject. He would first observe for the information of those present, who had not been personally connected with the Jains, that they were an exceedingly interesting community, and there was no more strange or weird sight than that of the stricter Jains, with their faces bound up with white cloths to prevent the possibility of an insect entering into their mouths, and so inadvertently destroying life! and holding little brooms in their hands with which they carefully swept the ground before them, or the seat upon which they were going to sit, in order that they might not tread, or sit, on any living thing. Many of the stricter members of the community lived in monasteries or nunneries, in the most ascetic fashion, eating only food which was the refuse of the meals of others, drinking only dirty water, and performing all sorts of menial offices. He thanked Mr. Gandhi for having directed the attention of English students to the Jain Philosophy and creed, and would ask to be informed regarding the difference, now somewhat obscure, between the dogmatic teaching of Jainism and Buddhism. To his mind there was amongst the creeds of the world none so fascinating as Buddhism. It was purely atheistic in the best sense of the world, with an ethical system, which provided for mankind a future of happiness or misery, according to whether the course of life on earth had

been virtuous or vicious. The subtleties so ingeniously suggested by the chairman were after all of very little practical importance. The question present in the minds of most of them, he thought, was what was the differentiation between Buddhism and Jainism. Was there really any philosophical difference between the two creeds ?

Mr. Coldstream had listened with great pleasure, and derived much instruction from the address. None of them who had lived in India could have failed to be interested in the development of this most interesting system. At the beginning of his address the lecturer had told them of the statue carved by the carpenter which needed to be clothed. They would like very much if he, the lecturer, or other competent scholar, would do something to clothe the bare statue of the abstract description of Jainism by a description of the practical life of the Jain people. There were a good many Jains in the Punjab. In the Central Punjab (he did not think they extended as a clan beyond the Ravee) they were called Bhabrahs, while in the parts about Delhi and Hissar they were known as Saraogis. The developments of the system in everyday life formed an interesting study as to their views of the sanctity of life and their vegetarianism. In some parts of the country it took the form of a hesitation in using vegetables of a certain kind, those, for instance, of a red colour, because, he supposed, red was the

colour of blood.\* The Jains were a mercantile community, very much respected, and a people who carried weight in many ways. They had many interesting customs. In the district with which he was connected they used to put their families into ox-carts, and drive them through country by-roads to a very remote village, where there was a shrine, or place of ancestral sanctity or veneration.† He made these remarks to emphasize

---

\*In Hoshiarpur, Punjab, the unwillingness of the Bhabrah women to handle raw vegetables of particular kinds—some probably on account of their red colour. and others, perhaps, because of the insects adhering to them—led them to get their neighbours of less scrupulous views to cut up their raw vegetables, and prepare them for the pot.

Again, the jat and “Bagari” peasantry in the Hissar and Scosa districts are so imbued with the tenets of Jainism in the direction of the preservation of animal life, that they are seriously annoyed when a sportsman appears in the neighbourhood of their villages to shoot antelope, which there abound.

†This remote village is called Fattehpore. He (the speaker) was never able to visit it, but it lies, he believes, twenty to thirty miles north-east of Hoshiarpur, at the base of or in, the Siwalik hills. It contains, not improbably, some very ancient remains.

his feeling that the Jain people were deserving of intimate study ‡

Mr. Whish thought they owed a debt to the lecturer for having brought so important a subject to their notice. One of the first necessities for successful administration in India was to comprehend the vast congeries of races and customs, and for that comprehension tolerant and sympathetic views or religions whose tenets conflicted with their own were essential. The historical part of the question was of intense interest. It was at first thought that Jainism was an offspring of Buddhism but later researches had shown that the fact was the other way. It would be interesting if the lecturer could give them information on this subject. The subject suggested by the chairman as to the extent to which Jainism was indebted to the Greek inspiration was also a subject of great interest. He could not follow the lecture in his philosophical observations. It seemed almost too intricate a subject for any one but an expert. He thought that all movements for the humane treatment of animals must be largely indebted to

---

‡ The Bhabrah women are known in Hoshiarpur for their skill and industry in needlework—in the production especially of those handsome embroideries, coloured floss of coarse quality sown on a ground of coloured cotton cloth, called in the Punjab phulkari or chob, so much in demand for domestic decoration in England and elsewhere.

Jainism. When the present war was over, public attention would no doubt be turned to the treatment of horses, which he believed had suffered more than the men. Another subject of interest was the correspondence between the Jain architecture and English Gothic.

Sir William Rattigan said that there was one part of the lecture which he thought might have been a good deal amplified, to which Sir Lepel Griffin had referred, namely, how far Buddhism was indebted to Jainism for its general precepts. He could bear testimony to what had been said of the character of the men who professed the Jain religion. They were of a very estimable character, men of high principles, keeping aloof from all other agitations which led to nothing but embroilment with other communities.

Sir Roland Wilson had no special acquaintance with the Jains, beyond having once visited their very beautiful temple at Ahmedabad, where what struck him most was in the first place that, as in the Mahommedan mosque, he was expected to take his boots off before entering, but that, as was not the case in the mosque, he was provided instead with a pair of slippers, and next that he there saw what he had not expected to see, priestesses taking an important part in the prayers. Pending the answer of the lecturer to the very interesting question put by Sir Lepel Griffin and others, as to the relations between Jainism and Buddhism, he thought he might assume that in those respects, which

chiefly interested such an audience as the present, the two were practically identical. Jainism and Buddhism were alike in being practically atheistical, but combining with that, a very definite belief in law and personal responsibility, and a capacity for extreme self-denial in obedience to that impersonal law. In England also it was easy to meet with highly conscientious agnostics; but it did not follow that the position was intellectually tenable. He himself thought it was not, and referred to the recent masterly treatise of Dr. James Ward, of Cambridge. Another point common to Buddhism and Jainism was the aversion to the taking of life, and consequently to all forms of fighting, even when purely defensive. In that it seemed to him they had an explanation in a great measure of the presence in India, first of the Mahommedans, and then of the British. He thought that the essential contradiction between the existence of a State and the principle of non-resistance was sufficient to explain the ultimate downfall of Buddhism. True, the Jains survived, and were still (as the lecturer had shown) very useful members of the community; so were the Quakers in this country; but the existence and usefulness of both were dependent on the willingness of others, who did not share their principles, to afford them protection.

Mr. Martin Wood felt that there was a little deficiency in the historical part of the matter. He had not gathered personally the difference between Buddhism and Jaini-



sm in point of order. Was it not that the Jains entered more into practical life ? Did not the Jains set up the system of honouring their chief men ? It was new to him that Jainism preceded Buddhism.

The Hon, J. D. Rees said that the questions as to the differences between the Jains and the Buddhists rather referred to doctrinal differences. As far as he had seen the Jains, he had not been able to see in their life and conversation any difference between them and the Hindus around them. He would like to ask to what extent Jainism was a living religion, so as to differentiate its professors from the Hindus around them.

Mr. Gandhi said; Ladies and gentlemen, I sincerely thank the speakers for their sympathetic observations and their desire to have certain points cleared. The time at our disposal being limited, I hope you will excuse me if I condense my remarks. The first point demanding explanation is the relation between the Jain philosophy and the early Greek philosophy. In my view there is no relation between them. The early Greek philosophers were pure physiologists; they mainly studied the material universe, and that in a rudely observational manner. We cannot call them materialists, for the antithesis between matter and spirit was unknown to them. The cosmic matter passed with them for something in itself living; they thought of it as animated, just as are particular organs. It is native hylozoism. They were in search of an ultimate ground

of the universe. The earliest Jain records, on the other hand, dispense with this way of looking upon philosophical questions. They distinctly teach that the cosmos has no beginning and no end. The search for its origin is therefore futile. This does not mean that the state or modality of the cosmos is the same at all times. It is constantly changing. Any particular state is the resultant of previously operating causes, which, in their turn are the results of other previously operating causes and so on, without coming to a stop. The search for a cause or origin is the outcome of the inner conviction of the human mind that a state of things must be the effect of sufficient cause or causes. The cause or causes, when found, must necessarily, by the same logic, be the effects of other causes, and so on. To stop at some causeless cause is suicidal to the inner conviction just referred to. The fact is that when the mind in its search for the origin of the universe stops at something, it is because of its inability (lack of capacity) to go further, or to grasp or imagine a previous state of things. Next the antithesis between matter and spirit is clearly drawn in the earliest Jain canonical books. These works are the records of the teaching of Mahavira, the last *Arhat*, who lived about the time of the Ionic philosophers. Later, when Alexander the Great came to India, Jain philosophy was already an established system. If there is any borrowing at all, it must be on the part of the Greeks. The chairman has detected a similarity between Thales

view that water or moisture is the origin of the world, and the Jain view that moist clay, etc., have life. He therefore remarks that the Jains are trespassing very much on the field of Thales, whose idea was that it was moisture which constituted the life; and that the Jain idea appears to be of a universality of life, existing under these particular conditions, in which you contrive to expel more or less moisture. On reference to my paper, you will see that, in the Jain view, even fire, which is a negation of moisture, has life. Besides, according to Thales, the whole cosmos is a living thing; according to Jains, there are living as well as lifeless things in the world.

The statement that the Jains are advocates of the development theory was made to contrast the Jain view with that of the Vedanta, and not in reference to the origin of the world, nor was it in reference to the development of "all phenomenal existence from central real existence which lies behind." I think I must put the Jain view about phenomenal and noumenal existence in a clearer form. In the Kantian philosophy, noumenon is that which can be the object only of a purely intellectual intuition. To such an existence the Jains have no objection; nay, they postulate the existence of realities which are supersensuous. Such realities are a part of the cosmos, but not a cause or origin of it. There are other Western philosophers who advocate the

view that behind the world of phenomena there is an impenetrable world of noumena, that behind this apparent existence there is a hidden existence, of which the varied phenomena are but fleeting manifestations, that things in themselves are necessarily different from things in relation to us. In brief, a noumenon in their view is a thing as it is apart from all thought; it is what remains of the object of thought after space, time, and all the categories of the understanding are abstracted from it. To this view the Jains give an emphatic denial. The Jain position is; First, that right knowledge is the only test or measure on our part of the existence of a reality; secondly, that knowledge is always the knowledge of relations; thirdly, that reality is never out of relations (a particular reality may not be in physical relation with another reality, it may be in the relationship of subject and object, knower and known), and fourthly, that the relations are constantly changing. To be is to be in relation. So when we know a thing, we know the relations—some, if not all—in which it stands to us and to other things. *To that extent we know the thing as it is.* There are other present relations which we do not know, and there are other possible relations also which we may not know under our present state of development. This residuum of relationships is the noumenon. The task of our research ought to be to fix these unknown relations, and not to go in quest of the phantom "thing in itself." As

Mr. George Henry Lewes says: "The illusion of an existence underlying the appearance arises from our tendency to dissociate abstractions from their concretes, and endow the former with a permanent reality denied to the latter." Noumenon and phenomenon are not two separate existences, but only two modes of our looking upon the full content of a thing, a part of which is known and part unknown to us now. The fallacy in the popular mind in reference to these terms is that of confounding a logical distinction with an actual separation.

This leads me to the next point that demands explanation, namely, the difference between Jainism and Buddhism. In the Buddhist view, nothing is permanent. Transitoriness is the only reality. As Professor Oldenberg says: "The speculation of the Brahmans apprehended being in all being, that of the Buddhists becoming in all apparent being." The Jains, on the contrary, consider being and becoming as two different and complementary ways of our viewing the same thing. Reality in the Jain view is a permanent subject of changing states. To be, to stand in relation to be active, to act upon other things, to obey law, to be a cause, to be a permanent subjects of states, to be the same to-day as yesterday, to be identical in spite of its varying activities, these are the Jain conceptions of reality. Mere becoming is as much an abstraction as mere beings. In short, being and becoming are complements of the full notion of a

reality. besides, Buddhism discards the idea of individuality. Jainism, on the other hand, considers individuality in the twofold aspect of permanence and transiency. The individual, in the Jain view, continues to exist in different states. Next the Buddhist idea of the *summum bonum* is undefined. The Jain idea is that of perfection of the individual. Jainism teaches the doctrine of soul, Buddhism denies it. There are many other differentiating points, but these will do for our present purposes.

Referring to Jain psychology and logic, the interpretations which the Chairman gave of certain words and expressions occurring in the paper—e g., “condensation.” “diffusiveness”—are correct, and I must thank him for his remarks in that line. I used the phrase “indefinite cognition. By that I mean that state of the mind in which there is no clear differentiating notion about the object. It is a state in which the mind in a vague way feels that it (the object) is something. It is the state of the mind prior to analysis. In the absence of any special word which would signify this idea, I used the words “indefinite cognition,” the Greek equivalent of which is synthesis.

The historical fact now revealed about the priority of Jainism over Buddhism is, I am sorry to say, known

only to a few outside the circle of Oriental scholars. I would refer those who are anxious to study this question to the learned introductions by Professor Jacobi to vols. xxii. and xlv. of the Sacred Books of the East Series.

At this stage I am bound to admire the faculty of observation which those of you who have lived in India had exercised in reference to the strange habits and customs of the people. For instance, Sir Lepel Griffin alludes to certain Jains who cover their faces with white cloths to prevent the possibility of an insect entering into their mouths, and so inadvertently destroying life. Sir Roland Wilson, when visiting the Jain temple at Ahmedabad, was struck with the fact that Jains asked him to take off his boots, but that instead he was offered a pair of slippers; also that there were priestesses in the temple taking part in the prayers. Mr. Coldstream observed the fact that in the Punjab Jains hesitated to eat vegetables of red colour. The Jains referred to by Sir Lepel are a new sect, which came into existence only 200 years ago. They are known as Dhundhias (Sthanakvasi). Their habits and life are extremely unclean. The older Jains teach that the constant covering of the mouth and nose with cloth makes the breath so poisonous that it destroys more life than open breathing would do; also that uncleanliness generates and destroys more animalculæ than

are destroyed by keeping clean. Such sporadic movements are likely to arise in any country and in any religion. Students and scholars ought not to form any judgment about a philosophical system from the doings of such persons. If I know nothing of Christianity, and happen to attend a Methodist revival meeting and observe the doings of the persons present, I might as well come to the conclusion that the characteristics of Christianity are that its ministers wear frock-coats, that they raise their hands when uttering the benediction, that they stamp their feet on the floor of the pulpit when they deliver sermons, and that the congregation get religion when they shout in a wild manner. What a poor idea of Christianity! I am gratified to know, however, that there are moments in the life of you Englishmen when you patiently try to understand the subtle and doctrinal differences in the various philosophical systems. But for this fact, I could not have addressed you to-day.

I appreciate Sir Roland Wilson's remarks very highly. The reason why the Jains of Ahmedabad asked him to take off his boots when entering the temple in that leather, in the Jains view, is considered unclean. But as we know that it is difficult for Europeans to walk unless they have some kind of footgear on, we offer them slippers of canvas, and thus try to make them comfortable when they are our guests in a temple, with



wounding our religious susceptibilities. The Mahomedans acted in a different way towards Sir Roland, because, in their view, they must literally carry out their religious injunctions.

There is another remark of Sir Roland which is very pertinent, namely, relating to the aversion of the Jains and Buddhists to the taking of life, and consequently to all forms of fighting, even when purely defensive. In that he finds an explanation, in a great measure, of the presence in India, first of the Mahomedans, and then of the British. In this connection I must observe that the Jain teaching is not that of non-resistance, as it is ordinarily understood. Even a strict Jain, when he takes the vow of non-killing, does so in the following words: ' I shall not deliberately kill an innocent being without a purpose' This shows what limiting conditions are joined by the idea of non-killing. As a matter of fact, non-resistance is now the characteristic of the Jains as well as Hindus. But I do not think it is the result of their aversion to taking life. Even the flesh eaters in India have ceased to fight, except those who are paid to do so. Some persons think that the Jain preaching of vegetarianism is the chief cause of the disappearance of fighting qualities from the Hindus. The fact is, that vegetarianism does not necessarily disincline a person to fight. The conquering soldiers of Rome and Sparta, the athletes and wrestlers of Greece, were generally abs-

tainers from flesh-meat. The true cause of the presence of foreigners in India as conquerors at various periods of its history is that the Hindus have been for centuries fighting and quarrelling among themselves, and that no sense of a common nationality was ever developed in them. Secondly, under those circumstances the conception of a modern Western State never entered into their mind. Hence, they respected the authority and laws of the sovereign ruling for the time being. For centuries they have been used to passive submission. The late Sir J. R. Seeley, Regius Professor of History at the University of Cambridge, says in his "Expansion of England" "I showed you that of the army which won our victories [in India], four-fifths consisted of native troops. That we were able to hire these native troops for service in India was due to the fact that the feeling of nationality had no existence there. Now, if the feeling of a common nationality began to exist there only feebly if, without inspiring any active desire to drive out the foreigner, it only created a notion that it was shameful to assist him in maintaining his dominion, from that day almost our Empire would cease to exist, for of the army by which it is garrisoned, two-thirds consist of native soldiers." The Hon. Mr. Rees wanted to know whether Jainism was a living religion, so as to differentiate its professors from the Hindus around them. The idea of the sanctity of life which permeates the Jains and which they forced on the minds of the Hindus,

is the living characteristic of the Jain religion. The sharp differentiations are visible only at the time of the birth of institutions. The conflicts they create in society are ultimately reduced to a state of equilibrium through giving and taking. So now, so far as masses are concerned, there will be found very little difference between Jains and Hindus. The philosophical part of a religion is grasped only by a few; the majority are satisfied with formalism. Still, the Hindu life has received an abiding impression from Jain teachings. As Mr. Whish suggested, all movements for the humane treatment of animals must be largely, and are, in fact, indebted to Jainism. If we search for the real difference we shall find it only when we compare a cultured (in the Hindu sense) with a cultured Jain (in the Jain sense). The cultured Hindu believes in the offering of oblations to the manes of his ancestors, and does offer them; the cultured Jain does not. The ethical vows of a cultured Jain are stricter than those of a cultured Hindu. The record of crime in India bears ample testimony to the fact that very few Jains commit violent crimes. Sir William Rattigan has told you that the Jains are of a very estimable character, men of high principles. I have already quoted the opinion of Lord Curzon about the Jains at the end of my paper.

In conclusion, I must again express my gratefulness to the Chairman and other speakers for their helpful

remarks and sympathetic criticisms, and also to the audience for the patience with which they have followed me in the treatment of an abstruse subject.

The lecture resumed his seat amidst applause.

The Chairman in the name of the meeting, thanked Mr. Gandhi both for his paper and for the observations he had made.

The proceedings then terminated.

---



# THE BOOKS FOR SALE

BY

Sheth Devchand Lalbhai

Jain Pustakoddhār Fund.

(IN SANSKRIT.)

१२

Rs. a. p.

1. \***Shree Veetrāg Stotra**—By Shree Hemchandrāchārya with the commentaries of Shree Prabhāchandra Suri and one of the disciples of Vishalrājy ... 0 8 0
2. \***Shramana Pratīcramana Sutra Vrittī**—By an ancient priest 0 1 6
3. \***Syādvād Bhāsha**—By Shree Shubhvijaya Gani ... 0 1 6
4. \***Shree Pakshik Sutra**—with the commentary on Pākshika Sutra and Khāmnā—By Yashodev Suri ... 0 6 0

5. **\*Adhyātma Mata Parikshā**—By  
Mahāmahopādhyāya Shree  
Yashovijaya with his com-  
mentary... .. 0 6 0
6. **\*Shree Shodashak Prakarana**—  
By Haribhadra Suri with the  
commentaries of Shree Yasho-  
bhadra and Shree Yashovijaya. 0 6 0
7. **\*Shree Kalpa Sutra**—With the  
commentary Vinayvijaya Upā-  
dhyāya by Bhadrabāhu Svāmi 0 12 0
8. **\*Vandāru Vritti**—With the com-  
mentaries of Shree Devendra  
Suri ... .. 0 8 0
9. **\*Dānakalpadruma or The Life  
of Dhannā**—By Shree Jinkirti  
Suri ... .. 0 6 0
10. **\*Yoga Philosophy**—(English)—  
by Mr. Virchand R. Gāndhi... 0 5 0
11. **\*Jalpakaipa Latā**—By Muni  
Ratnamandan. ... .. 0 3 0
- 12 **\*Yoga-Drashti Samuchchaya**  
by Shree Haribhadra Suri,  
Commented by himself ... 0 3 0

		Rs.	a.	p.
13. *Karma Philosophy (Eng.)—				
Mr. Virchand R. Gāndhi ...	0	5	0	
14. *Ānand Kāvya Mahodadhi,—				
(Part I) A collection of classical Gujarāti Poems ...	0	10	0	
15 * Shree Dharma Parikshā—by				
Pandit Padmasāgar...	0	5	0	
16. *Shāstra Vārtā Samuchchaya				
By Shree Haribhadra Suri,				
with the commentaries of Shree				
Yashovijaya Upādhyāya ...	0	2	0	
17 *Karma Prakriti—By Shivsha-				
rmāchārya, commented by				
Shree Malayagiri Suri ...	0	14	0	
18. *Kalpa Sutra with the Story				
of Kālikāchārya—By Shree				
Bhadrabāhu Svāmi ...	0	8	0	
19. *Pancha Pratikramana Sutra				
—By an ancient Priest ...	0	4	0	
20. *Ānand Kāvya Mahodadhi				
(Part II)—A Collection of				
classical Gujarāti Poems ...	0	10	0	



21. **\*Upadesha Ratnākar—By Shree**  
Munisundar Suri ... 1 4 0
22. **\*Ānand Kāvya Mahodadhi**  
(Part III)—A Collection of  
classical Gujarāti Poems ... 0 10 0
23. **\*Chaturvinshati Jinānand**  
Stuti—By Shree Meruvijaya... 0 2 50
24. **\*Shat Purusha Charita—By**  
Muni Kshemanker Gani ... 0 2 0
25. **\*Sthul Bhadra Charitra—By**  
shree Jayānand Suri ... 0 2 0
26. **\*Shree Dharma Sangraha**  
(part I)—By Muni Mānvijiya  
Upadhyāya ... 1 0 0
27. **\*Sangrahani Sutra—By Shree**  
Shreechandra Suri with the  
commentaries of Shree Deva-  
bhadrā Suri ... 0 12 0
28. **\*Samyaktva Parikshā, Upa-**  
**desha Shatakam—By Shree**  
Vibhūdhavimala Suri... 0 2 0
29. **\*Lalita Vistarā, Chaityavan-**  
**dana Sutra—By Shree Hari-**

					Rs. a. p.
	bhadra Suri, with the com- mentaries of Shree Munichandra Suri ... ..	0	8	0	
30	Ānand Kāvya Mahodadhi (Part IV)—A Collection of classical Gujarāti Poems ...	0	12	0	
31.	*Anuyogadvār Sutra (1st Half) —By Shree Hemchandracharya	0	10	0	
32	Ānand Kāvya Mahodadhi (Part V)—A collection of classical Gujarāti Poems ...	0	10	0	
33	*Uttaradhyayana (Part I)— With the commentaries of Shree Bhadrabāhu Svāmi and Shree Shānti Suri ... ..	1	5	0	
34	*Malayasundari Charitra— By Shree Jayatilak Suri ...	0	7	0	
35	*Samyaktva Saptati—By Shree Haribhadra Suri with the com- mentaris of Shree Sanghatila- kāchārya ... ..	1	0	0	
36	*Uttarādhyayana (Part II)— With the commentaries of				

Shree Bhadrabāhu Svāmi and  
Shree Shānti Suri ... 1 12 0

**37 \*Anuyogadvār Sutra (IInd  
Half)—By Shree Hemchandrā-  
chārya ... 1 0 0**

**38 \*Gunasthāna Kramāroha—By  
Shree Ratnashekhar Suri and  
the commentary by himself... 0 2 0**

**39 \*Dharma Sangrahani (Part I)  
By Shree Haribhadra Suri with  
the commentaries of Shree  
Malayagiri ... 1 8 0**

**40 \*Dharma Kalpadruma-By Shree  
Udayadharma Gani ... 1 0 0**

**41 \*Uttarādhyayana (Part III)—  
With the commentaries of Shree  
Bhadrabāhu Svāmi and Shree  
Shānti Suri ... 1 14 0**

**42 \*Dharma Sangrahani (Part II)  
—By Shree Haribhadra Suri  
with the commentaries of Shree  
Malayagiri Āchārya ... 1 4 0**

		Rs.	a.	p
43	<b>Ānand Kāvya Mahodadhi</b> (Part VI) A collection of classical Gujarāṭi Poems. ...	0	12	0
44	<b>*Pinda Niryukti</b> —By Shree Bha- drabāhu Svāmi with the com- mentaries of Shree Malayagiri Āchārya ... ..	1	8	0
45.	<b>*Dharma Sangraha (2nd Half)</b> —By Shree Mānviyaya Upā- dhyāya ... ..	1	4	0
46.	<b>*Upamiti Bhava Prapancha</b> — By Shree Siddharshi Rishi ...	2	0	0
47.	<b>*Dasha Vaikalika Sutra</b> — By Shree Sayambhava Suri with the commentaries of Shree Haribhadra Suri ... ..	2	8	0
48.	<b>Shrāddha Pratikramana Su- tra</b> —with the commentaries of Shree Ratnashekhar Suri...	2	0	0
49	<b>*Upamiti Bhava Prapancha</b> (2nd Half)—By Shree Siddha- rshi Rishi. ... ..	2	0	0
50.	<b>Jivājivābhigam</b> —With the com- mentaries of Shree Malayagiri	3	4	0

51. **Sena Prashna, Prashno-  
tara Ratnākar**—By Shree  
Shubhavijaya Gani ... .. 1 0 0
52. **Jambu-dvipa Pragnapti (1st  
Half)**—With the commentaries  
of Shree Shantichandra ... 4 0 0
53. **Āvashyakvritti Tippana**—By  
Shree Hemchāndra Suri ... 1 12 0
54. **Jambu-dvipa Pragnapti (2nd  
Half)**—With the commentaries  
of Shree Shāntichandra ... 2 0 0
55. **\*Devasi Rāi Pratikramana**—  
By an ancient Priest ... .. 0 3 0
56. **Shripāl Charitra, Sanskrit**—  
By Shree Gnānavimal Suri ... 0 14 0
57. **Sukta Muktvāvali** ... .. 2 0 0
58. **Pravachana Sāroddhara (1st  
Half)**—By Shree Nemichandra  
Suri with the commentaries  
of Shree Siddhasena Suri ... 3 0 0
59. **Tandul Vaicharika (Chatuh-  
sarana)**—With the commen-  
taries of Shree Vijayāvimal ... 1 8 0

- Rs. a. p.
- 60] Vinshati Sthanaka Charita—**  
 By Shree Jivaharshagani ... 1 0 0
- 61. Kalpa Sutra—By Shree Bhadrabahu Svāmi with the commentaries of shree Vinayavijiya** 2 0 0
- 62. Subodha Samachari—By Shree Chandrachārya...** ... 0 8 0
- 63. Sirisirivalkaha ( Shreepala Charitra Prakrit )—By Shree Ratnashekhara Suri** ... 1 4 0

---

( In Press. )

---

**Pancha Vāstuk**

**Chau Sarana Payannā**

**Pravachana Sāroddhār ( 2nd Half )**

**Loka Prakāsha**

**Navapada Prakarna**

**Vichār Ratnākara.**

**Tattwārthadhigam Sutra**

**Ānand Kāvya Mahodadhi (Part VII)**

**(in Gujarati.)**

*Can be had at—*

**THE LIBRARIAN,**

**SETH DEVCHAND LALBHAI**

**JAIN PUSTAKODDHĀR FUND.**

**DEVCHAND LALBHAI DHARMSHALA,**

**Badekha Chaklo, Gopipura**

**SURAT. (INDIA)**

# THE BOOKS FOR SALE

BY

Shree Agamodaya Samiti.

(IN SANSKRIT.)

Rs. a p

1. \*Āvashyaka (Part I)—By Shree  
Sudharmā Svāmi with the com-  
mentaries of Shree Bhadrabāhu  
Svāmi and Shree Haribhadra  
Suri ... 2 4 ८
2. \*Āvashyaka (Part II)—By the  
same author with the commen-  
taries of the same two sacred  
monks ... 3 0 0
3. \*Āvashyaka (Part III)—As  
above the former parts ... 3 8 0
4. \*Āvashyaka (Part IV)—As  
above the former parts ... 1 0 0



5. \***Āchārāṅga (Part I)**—By Shree  
Sudharmā Svāmi with the com-  
mentaries of Shree Bhadrabāhu  
Svāmi & Shree Shilānkāchārya 1 8 0
6. \***Āchārāṅga (Part II)**—As above 2 4 0
7. \***Oupapātika Sutra**—With the  
commentaries of Shree Abhaya-  
deva Suri ... 0 12 0
8. 9. 10. 11. \***Paramāṇu, Nigoda,  
Pudgala, Bandha Chhatra** 0 6 0
12. \***Bhagavati Sutra (Part I)**—  
By Shree Sudharmā Svāmi  
with the commentaries of Shree  
Abhayadeva Suri ... 3 4 0
13. \***Bhagavati Sutra (Part II)**—  
By the same as above ... 3 8 0
14. **Bhagavati Sutra (Part III)**—  
Same as above... ... 3 4 0
15. \***Samvāyāṅga**—Same as above 1 0 0
16. \***Nandi Sutra**—By Shree Deva-  
vachaka Gani, with the com-  
mentaries of Shree Malayagiri 2 8 0

17. \*Ogha Nirryukti—By Shree Sudharmā Svāmi with the commentaries of Shree Bhādrabāhu Svāmi and Shree Dronāchārya 3 0 0
18. \*Sutra Kritāṅga—By Shree Sudharmāchārya with the commentaries of Shree Shilānkāchārya ... .. 2 12 0
19. \*Pragnāpana Sutra (1st Half)  
By Shree Shyāmāchārya with the commentaries of Shree Malayagiri ... .. 3 14 0
20. \*Pragnāpana Sutra (2nd Half)  
—As above ... .. 1 12 0
21. \*Sthānāṅga Sutra (1st half)—  
By Shree Sudharmā Svāmi with the commentaries of Shree Abhayadeva Suri ... .. 2 12 0
22. \*Sthānāṅga Sutra (2nd half)—  
As above ... .. 4 0 0

23. \*Antakridrashādi three Su-  
tras—With the commentaries  
of Shree Abhayadeva Suri ... 1 0 0
24. \*Surya Pragnapti—With the  
commentaries of Shree Mala-  
yagiri ... ... 3 8 0
25. \*Gnāta Dharmā Katha—By  
an ancient Priest with the com-  
mentaries of Shree Abhayadeva  
Suri ... ... 1 12 0
26. \*Prashna Vyākaranā—As above 1 12 0
27. \*Sādhu Samāchāri Prakarana  
—By an ancient Priest ... Free
28. \*Upāsaka Dashā—With the  
commentaries of Shree Abhya-  
deva Suri ... ... 0 10
29. 30. 31. 32. (2) Ashtaka Praka-  
rana (2) Shat a Darshana  
Samuchchaya—By Shree Ha-  
ribhadra Suri and others ... 0 4 0

33. Nirvyāvali Sutra—With the com-  
mentaries of Shree Shreechan-  
dra Suri ... .. Rs. a. p.  
... 0 12 0

34. Visheshavashyaka Gāthānā-  
mākārādi Kramaha ... 0 5 0

35. Vichārsāra Prakarana—By  
Shree Pradyumna Suri with  
the commentaries of Shree  
Mānikyasāgar ... .. 0 8 0

36. Gachchhāchāra Payannā—  
With the commentaries of  
Shree Vānar Rushi ... .. 0 6 0

37. Dharma Bindu Prakarana—  
By Haribhadra Suri with the  
commentaries of Shree Muni-  
chandra Suri ... .. 0 12 0

38. Visheshāvashyaka (Transla-  
tion Gujarāti) (Part I)—By  
Jinabhadra Gani, Translator  
Mr. Chunilal Hakamchand ... 2 0 0

		Rs. a. p.
39. Jain Philosophy—( English )		
	V. R. Gandhi	1 0 0
40. Yoga Philosophy	,,	0 14 0
41. Karma Philosophy	,,	0 12 0

---

**( In Press. )**

- 1 Rāyapashreni.
- 2 Panch Sangrah.
- 3 Visheshavashyaka. (2nd Part)
- 4 Āchārpradip.
- 5 Nandi Sutra.
- 6 Āvashyaka Malayagiri.
- 7 Anuyogadhār.
- 8 Nandi Ādi.
- 9 Shobhan Stuti.
- 10 Jinānand Stuti.

*Can be had at:—*

THE LIBRARIAN,  
SHREE AGAMODAYA SAMITI,  
Devchand Lalbhai Dharmashala  
Badekha Chaklo, Gopipura,  
SURAT. (INDIA).

